MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW

27 MAY 1982

Iran-Iraq Conflict

Military Situation -- More than 16,500 Iraqis were killed or wounded and 19,000 captured during the Jerusalem operations, according to a Guards Corps and armed forces communique carried by Tehran radio. The communique noted that over 5,480 square km of Iranian territory had been liberated. Meanwhile, another military communique broadcast by the radio reported that Iranian forces repulsed an Iraqi offensive in the Shalamcheh region. It added that 60 Iraqis were killed when Iranian artillery units fired on Iraqi forces in the Toveyleh and Tutmal regions and on the Biarreh Garrison. The communique also claimed that one Iraqi plane was shot down over the Abadan area.

According to an Iraqi military communique carried by Baghdad radio, 238 Iranians were killed when Iraqi forward units pounded Iranian positions in Khorramshahr with all kinds of weapons. The communique said a large number of Iranian tanks and vehicles were destroyed by Iraqi air raids in the Khorramshahr area and in the area West of the Karun River.

Arab Reaction to War -- Egypt believes Iran will stop at the international border with Iraq because the Iranians realize that any border violation means disturbing the network of regional, international and Arab interests, Egyptian President Husni Mubarak stated during an interview with the Kuwaiti paper AS-SIYASAH, KUNA reported. Mubarak noted that Egypt is closely watching the situation and warned that a change in regime in Iraq would not be in the interest of the region. He also cautioned the Iranian leadership against putting forward illogical demands as a result of elation following its army's progress.

The London paper ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT, citing "highly-placed" Arab sources, reported that several Arab countries have officially warned Iran that they will not stand idly by, regardless of the consequences, if Iranian forces cross the Iraqi border.

In an interview with the Saudi paper AR-RIYAD cited by SPA, Crown Prince Fahd stressed that the continuation or extension of the war would be at the expense of the region's stability and safety.

Iran

The war with Iraq will end only when Iran's legitimate demands have been met, government spokesman Ahmad Tavakkoli declared at a news conference reported by Tehran radio. He warned that Iran would take whatever steps are necessary to safeguard the security of its borders. Tavakkoli said the war cannot be considered ended while Iraq, in desperation after the capture of 40,000 of its troops, continues to attack Iranian cities with long-range artillery.

Commenting on Iran's relations with other Islamic countries, Tavakkoli said Iran wishes to live as a brother with the countries of the region under the banner of Islam and not under the American banner. He added that Iran would not remain silent if some countries in the region wish to act in accordance with American orders, including the return of Egypt to the Arab fold.

Israel

Relations With U.S. -- A joint U.S.-Israeli military committee will meet soon to discuss cooperation involving Israeli military industries, Jerusalem radio revealed in a report on the outcome of Defense Minister Ari'el Sharon's talks with U.S. officials. The United States will buy Israeli equipment, the radio said, and the Defense Ministry will be able to spend some U.S. aid on purchasing Israeli-made arms. The radio also said Pentagon officials had confirmed that the United States will sell Israel 75 advanced F-16 fighter planes for around $2.5 billion. Meanwhile, Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir told the Knesset in remarks broadcast by the radio that in light of proposed U.S. arms sales to Jordan, Israel is worried by the contradictions in U.S. policy. Israel will not be able to put up with these moves and cannot afford to wait until Jordan accumulates offensive power sufficient for an attack on Israeli population centers, he declared. In a similar vein, Sharon said in remarks broadcast by the radio that he had expressed concern to the Americans that any addition of sophisticated weapons to Arab countries puts Israel in a difficult situation. While Israel has stopped the arms race, Sharon contended, the Arabs are advancing their arms procurement at full speed.

Arms for Iran, Ecuador -- In an interview with NBC-TV, Sharon disclosed that Israel has supplied Iran with a small quantity of arms and ammunition, Jerusalem television reported. Meanwhile, Ecuadorean officials confirmed that Israeli-made arms found in an Ecuadorean cargo plane by Kennedy airport customs officials were intended for the Ecuadorean Government's exclusive use, according to Jerusalem radio reports. Noting that U.S. officials are investigating whether the arms were intended for Argentina, the radio said the Israeli Foreign Ministry has again assured the British ambassador that there is no truth in any report that Israel is shipping arms to Argentina. Prime ministerial adviser Uri Porat likewise denied that the aircraft detained in New York is carrying arms for Argentina, the radio noted.

Mine Explosion -- A fuel truck was damaged by an antivehicle mine on a dirt road in the Beersheba District, ITIM reported.

Syria

President Hafiz al-Asad held talks with Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Damascus radio reported. The talks dealt with Syrian-Soviet relations and the results of Arkhipov's discussions with Syrian officials in Damascus. According to earlier radio reports, Arkhipov also held talks with Foreign Minister 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam and Prime Minister 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm.

Lebanon

French Premier Pierre Mauroy visited Beirut briefly for talks with Lebanese leaders and to attend a requiem for the victims of the recent explosion at the French Embassy, Beirut radio noted. In statements reported by the radio, Mauroy said France will remain firm in facing these "criminal, cowardly actions, will not give in to blackmail through violence and will not change its stand because of threats or crimes."

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Middle East and Africa

Vol V No 103 *27 May 1982*

MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA REVIEW i

INTER-ARAB AFFAIRS

At-Tarazi: U.S. Recognition of PLO De Facto [Paris AN-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AD-DUWALI 24-30 May] A 1
PLO's Al-Wazir Comments on 'Israeli Aggression' [Beirut MONDAY MORNING 17-23 May] A 1
PLO Executive Committee Meets Under 'Arafat [VOP] A 15

ARABIAN PENINSULA

SAUDI ARABIA

Crown Prince Fahd Comments on Regional Issues C 1
ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT Views Iraq-Iran War [London 26 May] C 2

YAR

Former Minister Receives 10-Year Prison Term C 4

EGYPT

Mubarak Interviewed on Arab Unity, Iraq-Iran War D 1
- KUNA Report on Interview D 1

Romanian Minister Andrei, 'Ali Hold Talks 26 May D 2
- 'Ali Speaks at Luncheon D 3
- Andrei Speaks at Luncheon D 3
- Andrei Meets Muhyi ad-Din D 4

Reaction to Costa Rican Embassy in Jerusalem [AL-AHRAM 26 May] D 4
Abu Ghazalah Interviewed on Iran-Iraq War [Jidda AL-MADINAH 23 May] D 5
Parliamentary Speaker Talib Discusses Autonomy D 7
Socialist Liberal Party Meets on Iran-Iraq War D 7

IRAQ

Armed Forces General Command Communique No 723 E 1

JORDAN

Prince Hasan's Activities in U.S. Reported F 1
- Further Report [AR-RA'Y 26 May] F 1

Armed Forces Commander Discusses Armament Policy [AL-UFUQ 25 May] F 1
AR-RA'Y Calls for Arab Nuclear Weapons [26 May] F 2

LEBANON

French Premier Mauroy Arrives for 5-Hour Visit G 1
- Affirms Strong Ties G 1
- Departs After Requiem G 2
- Al-Wazzan Hails Visit G 2

Sarkis Addresses Cabinet on Recent Bombings G 3
Haddad Says Palestinians Violating Cease-Fire G 3

SYRIA

- Romania's Ceausescu Concludes Visit 26 May H 1
  - Meets With Yasir 'Arafat [VOP] H 1
  - Closed Meeting With Al-Asad H 1
  - Departs Damascus H 1
- USSR's Ivan Arkhipov Continues Visit to Damascus H 1
  - Meets With Khaddam H 1
  - Meets With Prime Minister H 2
  - Meets With Al-Asad H 2
- VOL Reports Clashes, Explosions in Aleppo H 2

ISRAEL

- Minister Sharon Warns of Middle East Arms Race I 1
- Reaction to Sharon Remarks on Arms to Iran I 1
  - Alignment MK Demands Recall I 1
  - Cabinet To Discuss I 1
- Papers Criticize Government Support for Iran I 2
- Shamir Criticizes U.S. Arms Sales to Jordan I 2
  - Warns of Consequences I 2
  - Further Remarks I 3
- Officials React to Charge of Arms to Argentina I 4
  - Begin Adviser Denial I 4
  - Foreign Ministry Denial I 4
  - Adviser Reiterates Denial I 4
- Swiss Defense Ministry Denies Arms Deal I 5
- Involvement Denied in Beirut Embassy Bombing I 5
- Haddad: 'Terrorists' Continue To Infiltrate I 5
- Northern Border Reported Quiet Following Clash I 6
- 'Bored' Mercenaries Reported Leaving Lebanon [YOMAN HASHAVU'A 26 May] I 7
- Antivehicle Mine Explodes; Truck Damaged I 7
- Arabs Sentenced for Throwing Molotov Cocktails I 7
- Eytan Says Egypt Cooperating Against Terrorism I 7
- Tabah Talks With Egypt End in Disagreement I 8
- MAPAM Will Not 'Break Up' Alignment Coalition I 8
- Begin Desires Action To Protest Greece-PLO Ties [YOMAN HASHAVU'A 26 May] I 8
- Eban, France's Cheysson Hold Political Talks I 9
- Ehrlich Ends United Kingdom Visit, Comments I 9
- Burg Returns From International Tour, Comments I 9
- Italian Prime Minister To Make Official Visit I 9
- Police Reinforcement on Golan Heights Explained I 10
- POST Poll Shows Smaller Parties Losing Support [27 May] I 10
- PORI Polls Public on Likud, Alignment Images [HA'ARETZ 26 May] I 11
- Briefs: Venezuelan Health Minister I 12

INTER-AFRICAN AFFAIRS

- Reports Ethiopian-Sudan Border Activity [Doha 24 May] P 1

NORTH AFRICA

ALGERIA

Chadli Bendjedid Receives Saudi Foreign Minister Q 1
FLN Delegation Leaves for Moscow 26 May Q 1

MAURITANIA

Haydala Welcomes France's Mitterrand 26 May Q 1

MOROCCO

Chamber Official Addresses Bulgarian Delegation [LE MATIN 7 May] Q 2

TUNISIA

Saudi Foreign Minister Brings Arab Unity Message Q 3

EAST AFRICA

KENYA

KANU Council Endorses Odinga's Expulsion R 1

CENTRAL AFRICA

CONGO

Gabonese President Arrives in Brazzaville 26 May [AFP] S 1
Foreign Minister Comments on International Issues [AFP] S 1

WEST AFRICA

GHANA

Asamoah Leads Delegation to Nonaligned Meeting T 1
Iran To Supply Oil, Exploration Expertise T 1

GUINEA

Prime Minister Receives Chedli Klibi Message [AFP] T 1

IVORY COAST

Mitterrand 21 May Abidjan Dinner Speech T 2

NIGERIA

Question of Relations With Israel Examined T 5

SENEGAL

More on French President Mitterrand's Visit T 5
  Speech in Saint-Louis [AFP] T 5
  Press Conference T 6
  Visit Ends T 8
Diouf on Relations with France, Other Topics [Paris] T 8

SOUTHERN AFRICA

ANGOLA

Communique Issued on Gabonese President's Visit U 1

LESOTHO

South Africa Accused of Involvement in Attacks [AFP] U 2

SOUTH AFRICA

Foreign Minister Reacts to Lesotho's Charge U 2

AT-TARAZI: U.S. RECOGNITION OF PLO DE FACTO

PM251225 Paris AN-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AD-DUWALI in Arabic 24-30 May 82 p 27

[Unattributed report: "At-Tarazi tells AN-NAHAR AL-'ARABI WA AD-DUWALI: There Is De Facto U.S. Recognition of the PLO"]

[Text] The PLO's observer at the United Nations, Zuhdi at-Tarazi, has stated there is a de facto U.S. recognition of the PLO and that contacts between them are made by proxy.

Speaking to AN-NAHAR AL'ARABI WA AD-DUWALI about the present U.S. attitude, At-Tarazi said: "The United States is, in a way, determined to ignore the existence of the Palestinians and their rights and role in any efforts to promote a comprehensive settlement of the so-called Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East. The United States is maintaining this at a time when the whole world is acknowledging that the Palestine question is the core of the conflict. It is as if the United States wants to impose an American solution featuring the Camp David agreement. On this matter I do not see any difference between the present U.S. administration and its predecessor."

In reply to a question about contacts between the PLO and the United States, At-Tarazi said: "There are indirect contacts with the United States, through university professors, congressment and senators. There is a de facto recognition of the PLO. Washington's precondition for any official contact is that the PLO accept certain political concepts. The United States usually makes its contacts through the UN secretary general who conveys the U.S. views to us. For example, the secretary general last Sunday contacted us to convey the U.S. concern about the situation in southern Lebanon and the U.S. hope we would exercise self-restraint. Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] replied that the aggression was started by the Israelis."

Referring to recent U.S. statements about the possibility of official U.S. participation in the autonomy negotiations, At-Tarazi said: "This reflects U.S. obduracy and determination to continue to disregard the existence of the Palestinians. I can confirm, however, that there is not a single Palestinian willing to negotiate. They all say the PLO is the sole representative of the Palestinian people in any political negotiations."

On the Arab attitude toward the United States, he said: "Obviously there is no clear Arab policy toward those who support Israel and encourage it to persist in its aggression. The Arabs can take measures outside the framework of the United Nations at a bilateral level. Europe has supported Britain on the question of the Malvinas and they have imposed sanctions without waiting for the United Nations. So, what are the Arabs waiting for? Is the Security Council a wailing wall? The lawful retaliation should come from the Arabs. The Arabs can close their markets to U.S. products."

PLO'S AL-WAZIR COMMENTS ON 'ISRAELI AGGRESSION'

NC261405 Beirut MONDAY MORNING in English 17-23 May 82 p 16-26

[Interview given by Khalil al-Wazir, PLO deputy commander in chief, to Lydia Georgi of Beirut MONDAY MORNING 13-14 May -- conducted in Arabic -- place not given]

[Text] Khalil al-Wazir (Abu Jihad), deputy commander of the PLO's mainstream Fatah organization, stated last week that any future Israeli attack on Palestinian positions in Lebanon would draw "limited, medium or more violent" retaliation -- depending on the scale of the attack and the circumstances prevailing at the time.

In a private interview with MONDAY MORNING, Abu Jihad said that the Palestine Liberation Organization, bound by its commitment not to mount any military operations from Lebanese territory, would always avoid responding to Israeli attacks from south Lebanon.

"However," he added, "if the Israeli enemy starts the battle and escalates it to claim civilian victims in south Lebanon, then we will have no alternative but to defend ourselves and our Palestinian and Lebanese people in the south. Such a decision would be shaped by various factors, including the conditions of the south, the political situation and the views of all the parties present in Lebanon."

The Israelis have so far mounted two air raids on Palestinian positions in Lebanon -- one on April 21 and one on May 9.

Abu Jihad noted that the Palestinians, after studying the objectives of the raid and consulting various parties in Lebanon, decided not to respond to the April 21 raid because "We did not want to give the enemy the opportunity to go ahead with the major military operation for which he had prepared himself," because "We wanted to drive home to the world the aggressive nature of the Israeli enemy" and because "We did not want developments to lead to more aggression which would affect the Lebanese arena and harm our people in south Lebanon."

But when the Israelis mounted their second attack on May 9, Abu Jihad said, "We took an immediate decision to respond, striking at (Israeli) settlements and military positions in the occupied north. The decision was in favor of a limited response, rather than a wide-scale response, on the understanding that we would observe the results and act accordingly."

The Palestinian leader said the PLO remained committed to the July, 1981 Palestinian-Israeli cease-fire, but he emphasized that the cease-fire applied only to operations across the Lebanese borders.

"The desire of the PLO... to maintain the cease-fire on the Lebanese borders does not imply readiness to accept limitations on the struggle against Israeli occupation through operations in the interior or across other borders," he said. "We reaffirm the fact that our people have the full right to resist the Israeli military occupation which is still subjecting them to the ugliest forms of oppression. Our right to resist this occupation is a legitimate right which is recognized by all international laws and charters."

The Israelis, cornered by the Palestinian people's uprising in the occupied territories and recognizing the link between it and the PLO, had expanded the original interpretation of the cease-fire to cover all Palestinian operations anywhere, Abu Jihad said. Their objective was to find a pretext to violate the cease-fire and deal the PLO heavy blows, in the hope that this would demoralize the people in the occupied territories and stop their rebellion.

The Americans, he added, had submitted to "Israeli blackmail" and supported the Israeli interpretation of the cease-fire, but "The Israeli enemy is free to interpret as he wishes, and we are free to interpret according to our own convictions."

The PLO, Abu Jihad said, was still expecting a wide-scale Israeli military operation that would thrust deep into Lebanon, reaching the outskirts of Beirut. The aim would be to occupy the south and make withdrawal conditional on a peace treaty with Lebanon, the withdrawal of Syrian forces from Lebanon and the withdrawal of the "remnants of the Palestinian forces beyond the Syrian borders."

The Israelis, who had originally scheduled this major attack for February 18, had called up part of their reserves between February 10 and 14. They had subsequently "postponed" the operation for a variety of reasons -- including the refusal of the opposition Labor Party to approve the plan, the opposition of some members of the Likud Government and some military commanders, and the fact that the Polish situation had not escalated enough to provide "international cover" for the invasion.

Israel, the Palestinian leader added, was now waiting for the "appropriate circumstances" -- perhaps an escalation in the British-Argentine confrontation over the Falklands -- to launch its invasion.

Stressing that the Israelis would pay "an exorbitant price" if they went ahead with their invasion plans, Abu Jihad said the Lebanese-Palestinian joint forces would depend on themselves first and foremost to confront the invasion. He predicted that other Arab countries would join the battle only if their positions were attacked, and he stated that he did not expect Soviet military support to drive the Israelis back -- although he did expect Moscow's political backing.

As for the unified Arab strategy that Lebanon was seeking for the south, that was not likely to materialize given present Arab divisions, Abu Jihad said.

On another subject, Abu Jihad said the Palestinians had nothing to do with the violence which raged in Tripoli, north Lebanon, last week.

Noting that some had used the Tripoli clashes to spread rumors of "Palestinian-Syrian differences which have reached the state of deterioration (in relations) and raised the possibility of a return to the atmosphere of 1976". Abu Jihad said: "Those who are spreading such rumors are greatly mistaken, because the position of the Palestinian Revolution is that regardless of the circumstances, it is not in Syria's interests nor in the Palestinians' interest... to see a return to that horrible nightmare."

Fatah, he said, believed that it was of the utmost importance to maintain a unified position with Syria. "And if, along the way, we come across certain conceptions or partial differences... it is essential that we step over them quickly and leave their effects behind us so that we can continue our trek together."

He added: "We emphasize that we see nothing that justifies concern in our relations with Syria, because in every meeting with the Syrian leadership, we discuss all new developments frankly, anxious to deal with any problem that crops up without delay, before it can have repercussions due to the complex current situation, which is teeming with new interactions in Lebanon and the Arab world."

The following is a translation of the full interview, which was conducted in Arabic on Thursday and Friday, May 13, 14:

[Question] Why did the Palestinian resistance respond to the latest Israeli raid and refrain from any response to the April 21 raid? Does this mean that you have decided to respond to any Israeli violation of the cease-fire in the future?

[Answer] To begin with, the cease-fire came after an Israeli policy of continuous war, "anytime, anywhere," against the Palestinian fedayeen -- a policy which followed the Litani battle of 1978 and was applied throughout 1979, 1980 and 1981. The Zionist enemy maintained this policy up to the 15-day battle of July 10, 1981. This battle had certain effects and repercussions which brought the Zionist enemy to the stage of accepting the cease-fire: It had effects on the northern (Israeli) settlements, it had psychological effects on the residents of the northern part of our occupied country -- effects which the enemy's leaders were afraid would snowball if that attrition developed, with all the destruction it inflicted on the Israeli institutions and settlements and kibbutzim in the north. All these effects were among the elements which led to the cease-fire.

When the cease-fire was applied, we believe that the Zionist enemy was disturbed by it.

This is because the Israeli interpretation of the cease-fire was that there should be no activity by the Palestinian Revolution inside our occupied country or across any Arab borders, whereas the cease-fire conditions of the Palestinians, as stated in the talks with (UN Interim Force in Lebanon Commander) Lt Gen (William) Callaghan in his capacity as representative of the presidents of the UN General Assembly and Security Council, were based on the following points:

First: that the the Zionist enemy must stop his aggressive military operations by land, sea and air, freezing all military activity against south Lebanon and the positions of the Palestinian Revolution or the joint forces of Lebanon.

Second: that Sa'd Haddad must be bound by this decision and stop all his military activities, because the decisions of Sa'd Haddad are linked to the Israeli decisions.

Third: that we in the Palestinian Revolution reaffirm the commitment we announced at the Arab summit conferences and to the various Lebanese governments not to cross the Lebanese borders in our activities and not to fire across those borders. We said we would remain bound by this commitment for the sake of Lebanon and our people in south Lebanon. However, this did not affect our legal right to resist the occupation of our country and continue our political and military struggle against this occupation, either in the occupied territories themselves or across the other Arab borders.

Thus, starting on the first day after the cease-fire, there was a succession of military operations inside the occupied territories, across the Jordanian borders and even across the Egyptian borders -- all of them underscoring the interpretation of the cease-fire.

In recent weeks, the enemy began focusing on a number of issues:

He began to escalate his oppression of our Palestinian people in the occupied territories, building up his terrorism and aggression against them.

He also began to blow up every (Palestinian) operation launched across the Jordanian or Egyptian borders, trying to turn it into a pretext for an attack on the Palestinian Revolution and the joint forces.

We know for a fact that on February 10, the Zionist army called up part of the reserves, including tank technicians and drivers and plane technicians and pilots, and completed this partial mobilization on February 14. We know for a fact that this was in preparation for a major operation against south Lebanon which was to be justified by the (Palestinian) military operations in the occupied territories but was in fact aimed at dealing the Palestine Liberation Organization a heavy blow.

All the signs indicated that a major military operation would be launched against south Lebanon. It was said that this operation would be aimed at the occupation of all of south Lebanon but would also go beyond the city of Sidon to cover the suburbs of Beirut. This was no secret: It was announced and discussed by the enemy's press as well as by the international press at the time.

The aims of this operation were spelled out by Ze'ev Schiff, the Israeli military commentator who is close to the Ministry of Defense and acquainted with the thinking of (Israeli Defense Minister Ari'el) Sharon. He made it clear that Sharon's aim was, first, not to make this operation another Litani operation, and second, not to merely kill a few hundred fedayeen but to deal the PLO a fatal military and political blow, "ending its existence."

That was how they envisaged the operation. They wanted the occupation (of the south) to be maintained until they could impose their conditons, and among those conditons was a new peace treaty with Lebanon, the withdrawal of the Syrian forces from Lebanon, the withdrawal of the remnants of the Palestinian forces beyond the Syrian borders, and the expansion of the UNIFIL forces and zone into a broad security belt.

Those ideas were expressed repeatedly, indicating the existence of an Israeli plan which is ready for implementation at any time, as soon as the required pretexts become available.

The Israeli operation was scheduled to start on February 18, 1982, but a number of factions prevented the Israeli enemy from mounting it, including the following:

First: the absence of unanimity among the ruling Israeli authorities and especially the stand of the opposition.

Second: the intensive international activity by the Palestinian Revolution and other Arab quarters to make it clear that matters would not stop at that point but that an Israeli attack would entail wider developments.

Third: The hesitation of the Israeli military command, which felt that the price which would be paid by the Israeli army in terms of human and other losses would be beyond imagination, since the Palestinian forces and the joint forces had developed their battle tactics and military capabilities to a point where it was certain that the price of occupation would be very exorbitant. This prompted objections to be raised, even within the ruling coalition. Thus, the representatives of the National Religious Party opposed the planned military operation because they knew what the cost would be, and those fears were echoed by a number of Israeli military commanders.

These considerations led to the postponement of the operation.

The state that followed was the stage of the Sharon-Begin-Shamir policy, which consisted in a series of threats addressed to the Palestinian Revolution -- an attempt at muscle-flexing and the threat of an all-out operation that would cripple the PLO. This trend was strengthened by the developments in the occupied territories: the continuous escalation of the popular Palestinian uprising.

The Palestinian uprising spread across the occupied territories and gave expression to the maturity of popular Palestinian action against Israeli military occupation, against the behavior of the occupation authorities, against the projects of civil administration and autonomy presented by the Begin government. The uprising projected a clear picture to the world of the adherence of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories to the PLO as their sole legitimate representative and as an expression of their determination to achieve their national rights, including the right to establish an independent Palestinian state. That is the picture the world saw when a Palestinian girl, mother, youth or old man walked out carrying the Palestinian flag to face Israeli bullets and brutality. All this demonstrated to the world that the links between the Palsestinian Revolution and the Palestinian people in the occupied territories could not be denied.

Hence the policy of the Likud government, led by Begin and Sharon and Shamir, of aiming blows at the PLO forces and the joint forces in south Lebanon, the object being to undermine the determination of the people in the occupied territories. The idea was that when the Palestinian people in the occupied territories saw such violent blows being dealt to the power on which their hopes were pinned, their will would weaken and their struggle would wane. Laboring under this illusion, the enemy prepared for an attack on the forces of the PLO and the Palestinian Revolution.

At the same time, the Israelis believed that their violent repression of the popular movement in the occupied territories would affect the morale of the PLO outside those territories. It was a concerted effort on the part of the Israeli Government to weaken the PLO politically on all levels -- the Palestinian level, the Arab level and the international level. This was and remains the conception of the Israeli command.

So there was this stream of threats which flowed out of Israel in March and April, the idea being to frighten the PLO and stop its military activities -- its activities across the other Arab borders, its activities in the interior and its support of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. That is what they imagined, but our answer was given clearly.

First: The Palestinian Revolution is not frightened by the constant Israeli threats, to which it has grown accustomed.

Second: The Palestinian Revolution is not afraid of engaging in battle with the Zionist enemy. On the contrary, it wants to maintain its constant confrontation with that enemy.

Third: The desire of the PLO and the leadership of the Palestinian Revolution to maintain the cease-fire on the Lebanese front does not imply readiness to accept limitations on the struggle against Israeli occupation through operations in the interior or across the other borders.

Fourth: The military forces of the PLO and the Palestinian Revolution are always in a position of self-defense, standing by the Palestinian-Lebanese joint forces to defend the Lebanese and Palestinian people in south Lebanon. They are always preparing themselves to confront any Israeli move, especially since they never lose sight of the gains Israel hopes to achieve in south Lebanon -- including the theft of Lebanese water and the creation of circumstances which would limit the mobility of the Palestinian Revolution.

What is the situation now?

We are now faced by an intransigent Israeli position in which the enemy's political and military leaders are still issuing threats in which the expression "total liquidation" is always included. They are threatening a single blow and total liquidation, declaring that they will not get involved in a war of attrition with the Palestinian resistance.

When they launched their April 21 attack, one of their ridiculous pretexts was the explosion of a mine near the UNIFIL zone. Those pretexts are completely fabricated. The mines they referred to could be old ones. We don't believe anyone could have planted them there, since they were close to the UNIFIL zone. In fact, they themselves announced initially that the mines were old and that one had been triggered by one of Sa'd Haddad's vehicles. Later, they decided to use the incident as a pretext to mount air raids on various areas in Ad-Damur, An-Na'imah and the Kharrub district -- an attack which embodied Israel's aggressive intentions before the entire world.

After this operation, in which no fewer than 17 martyrs fell and tens were injured, the joint Palestinian-Lebanese command studied the objectives, implications and possible follow-up of the attack, considered the nature of the situation in Lebanon, made contacts with many quarters and decided not to respond to the aggression for several reasons, including the following:

First, we did not want to give the enemy the opportunity to go ahead with the major military operation for which he had prepared himself.

Second, we wanted to drive home to the world the aggressive nature of the Israeli enemy.

Third, we did not want developments to lead to more Israeli aggression which would affect the Lebanese arena and harm our people in south Lebanon.

For all these reasons, we decided to keep the choice of the time and place of our response in our own hands and prepare ourselves for that response.

After that, things returned to normal on the front, but later, Zionist voices began to be raised again, demanding a major military operation. This was followed by another Israeli air attack on a number of positions, aimed at establishing the Israeli policy of retaliation after any incident that might occur in the occupied territories.

When the Israeli enemy mounted the second attack, we took an immediate decision to respond, striking at his settlements and military positions in the occupied north. The decision was in favor of a limited response, rather than a wide-scale response, on the understanding that we would observe the results and act accordingly -- especially since we were still expecting a major Israeli military operation.

We still expect such an operation to this moment, expecially in view of the intensive Israeli military activities that we have been witnessing. The Israeli council of ministers, for intance, has just met as a council of war, and the meeting was attended by most military commanders, who participated in the discussion of the approaching operation. The Knesset's foreign affairs and security committee has also held a meeting, and Sharon has gone to the U.S., preceded by a military operation -- an operation which we are positive the Israeli enemy is trying to choose the right circumstances for.

[Question] So you are still expecting this major operation which could reach the outskirts of Beirut?

[Answer] We are speaking about Israeli aims and ambitions. Those are Israel's aims: It wants to launch a wide-scale military operation; it is waiting to choose the right circumstances for the destruction of the PLO's military and political capability. This is Israel's permanent aim, and Israel is always looking for the appropriate time and circumstances to achieve that aim -- with the required international cover.

When the Israelis prepared themselves for the February operation, they were thinking of seizing the opportunity presented by the developments in Poland. Had that situation developed further, the Israelis would have made their move.

More recently, they have been thinking of taking advantage of the world's preoccupation with the Falklands issue and going ahead with the assault if the Argentine-British war escalates.

So it's not a question of time -- whether the operation will be launched now or later; it's a question of when the circumstances develop which the enemy regards as appropriate for the operation.

[Question] You say your decision after the latest attack was to go ahead with an immediate but limited retaliation. Will this also be your response to any future Israeli attacks, assuming that the major operation you are expecting does not take place?

[Answer] We say that each Israeli move requires a separate decision by the leadership. We as the leadership decide on our response in the light of the nature of the Israeli move. Each new Israeli operation will be responded to separately, and the response may be limited or medium or more violent, depending on the objective of the Israeli attack, the prevailing circumstances and our ability to respond.

[Question] I am talking about your response from south Lebanon.

[Answer] We always avoid responding from the south. We always study each battle separately, taking into consideration what Israel hoped to achieve in it, and decide on our response in the light of our findings, often avoiding any response through the south because of the south's special circumstances.

However, that does not mean that we will not sometimes opt for a direct response in that area -- especially if we find the enemy escalating and going beyond certain limits in his aggression against the south.

[Question] So if Israel attacks again, it is possible that the response will come from the south?

[Answer] As I said, we always try to avoid direct retaliation from the south. However, if the Israeli enemy starts the battle and escalates it to claim civilian victims in south Lebanon, then we will have no alternative but to defend ourselves and our Palestinian and Lebanese people in the south.

Such a decision would be shaped by various factors, including the conditions of the south, the political situation and the views of all the parties present in Lebanon.

[Question] You have given us the PLO's view of the cease-fire, which was arranged last July by Philip Habib with the help of Saudi Arabia and the U.N. How do those three parties -- the U.S., the UN and Saudi Arabia -- interpret the cease-fire agreement? Do they support the Israeli view that a bomb in Jerusalem or the assassination of an Israeli diplomat in Paris is a violation of the south Lebanon cease-fire?

[Answer] We expressed our opinion clearly in our meeting with Lt Gen Callaghan and we have since announced it in the media, so that the entire world knows our interpretation of the cease-fire: that we reaffirm our commitment not to undertake any activities across the Lebanese borders as long as the Israeli enemy does not take aggressive action there. That is the interpretation that was understood by all.

[Question] But do the three parties I mentioned accept your interpretation, or do they support the Israeli interpretation, which is completely different?

[Answer] When we presented our interpretation to the UN, there was no argument about it. Nor were there any arguments when we explained our interpretation to many international quarters. So this interpretation became a fact, and even the Israeli enemy saw that.

Recently, however, the Israeli enemy started playing another tune and launched a campaign to claim that any operation in the occupied territories or anywhere else in the world is a violation of the cease-fire. The Israeli enemy is free to interpret as he wishes, and we are free to interpret according to our own convictions.

[Question] So the UN did not argue with your interpretation. What about the U.S.?

[Answer] There has been no contact between us and the U.S., but what the American media and the State Department spokesman announced at the time was clear: The interpretation of the cease-fire was clear to everyone.

In recent weeks, however, we have seen (Secretary of State Alexander) Haig and other American leaders submitting to Israeli blackmail and repeating the Israeli tune: that any operation anywhere is a violation of the cease-fire. As far as we are concerned, however, we reaffirm the fact that our people have the full right to resist the Israeli military occupation which is subjecting them to the ugliest forms of oppression. Our right to resist this occupation is a legitimate right which is recognized by all international laws and charters.

[Question] You have drawn a direct link between the uprising in the occupied territories and the Israeli attacks on the Palestinians in Lebanon.

Does this mean that you believe that the Israeli attacks on the south will escalate as the Palestinian uprising escalates?

[Answer] A number of facts have been brought out in recent weeks with the escalation of the uprising in the occupied territories.

The uprising expressed the view of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories in all their groups and forces. It expressed the Palestinians' unanimous rejection of the plans of the Israeli occupation.

It started with the people's firm rejection of the Camp David conspiracy and the autonomy plans. This prompted the former American secretary of state, (Cyrus) Vance, when he visited some European countries after his last visit to the occupied territories, to say that the U.S., Israel and the Egyptian regime had failed to find one Palestinian personality willing to cooperate with them in the autonomy plan spawned by Camp David.

After that, our people in the interior continued to reject all Israeli projects. More recently, when Israel came up with the civil administration project and appointed Menahem Milson civilian governor of the West Bank, the Palestinian people reacted with a rebellion which went on for 47 days without interruption -- 47 days of demonstrations and strikes in the occupied territories.

Things quieted down for a few days after that, but the rebellion erupted again with the closure of Bir Zayt University, which was followed by the dismissal of the mayor of Al-Birah and the dissolution of its municipal council, then the dismissal of Bassam ash-Shak'ah and Karim Khalaf, mayors of Nabulus and Ramallah, then the attack on the Al-Aqsa Mosque, and then the dismissal of Wahid al-Hamdallah, mayor of 'Anabta.

These actions, and especially the Al-Aqsa Mosque aggression, turned the rebellion into a fiery volcano -- a revolution against occupation in every city, village, neighborhood and refugee camp. We saw the people confront the Israeli Army with stones and anything else they could get their hands on. Everyone took part in the uprising: men, women, old men, mothers and children, high school and university students, merchants, workers, farmers.... There could have been no more eloquent expression of the wrath of the people at the oppression, terrorism and humiliation to which the Israeli occupation authorities were subjecting them.

That was when Menahem Milson said that this was the Israelis' most dangerous battle since 1948. The statement presents a clear picture of the battle waged by the people in the occupied territories -- a battle which exposed the Zionist entity's fake democracy and gave the world an unobstructed view of the brutal, terrorist methods which the Israelis had been silently using to liquidate all the rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories.

It became clear to the world that the Israelis were like a beast clawing and tearing at the entire fabric of our people's life in the occupied territories -- their health, their cultural life, their agricultural life, their economic life, their educational life.... Every aspect of Palestinian life in the occupied territories had specialists among the Israeli military occupation authorities working out ways to destroy it.

There are many stories to illustrate how the Israelis are doing this -- too many to tell in a few pages.

Take the so-called "surtax," for instance -- one Israeli way of looting our people. A doctor who has been working for three months and has made no more than 600-700 dinars in this period is asked to pay the equivalent of 5,000 dinars. When he says he doesn't have the money, they take his medical equipment. And if the medical equipment does not cover the "tax," they go to his home and take his furniture. This is not fiction; it really happened.

They go to a shop which has an inventory worth the equivalent of 100,000 Lebanese pounds and impose a tax of 600,000 Lebanese pounds on it. The shop owner tells them to take his entire inventory, and they do, but they are not content with that; they mount a midnight raid on his home and take his furniture.

They fight the farmers by confiscating their lands to build more settlements. Today, there are no fewer than 131 Israeli settlements, new Israeli cities, in the occupied West Bank and Gaza, and now, after the withdrawal from Sinai, they have announced that 11-13 more settlements will be built. For the first time, Sharon has issued an appeal to all the Jewish people in the occupied territories to help build those settlements.

They are confiscating the Palestinians' lands and exhausting them, their aim being to force them out, so that they can have "a land without a people." That has always been their plan, and it still is.

The Palestinian people in the occupied territories are under attack from all directions, and it is this that has created in them a unanimous will to confront and resist; it is this which has given birth to the united popular uprising against the enemy.

This uprising has had its effects on the Israeli side, of course. The Israelis are worried about it violence, about the way it has spread, about the way it is continuously exposing their terrorism and brutality. The Israelis feel cornered, and they are trying to destroy the rebellion by all the means at their disposal. They know that this uprising is closely linked to the PLO. They know that the Palestinians in and outside the occupied territories are one unified whole with one unified position. They believe that by attacking the forces and the political presence of the PLO they can undermine the will of the people and their ability to resist in the interior. But things do not always work out as the Israelis imagine they will. Any military operation against the PLO is being answered by more solidarity and more resistance by the Palestinian people in the occupied territories, as demonstrated over the past few weeks.

[Question] Since we're talking about the uprising in the occupied territories, has the PLO failed to persuade the Arab countries to throw their material weight behind this uprising? In other words, do you feel that the political yield of this uprising in the Arab world and elsewhere matches the sacrifices that are being made by the people in the occupied territories?

[Answer] To begin with, the sacrifices the Palestinian people are offering in the occupied territories are part of their historical heritage of struggle. The Israeli oppressing and expansionism which our people are facing only increases their determination to offer more sacrifices. Tens of martyrs have fallen and hundreds have been injured in this latest uprising. According to the announced figures, 500 have been wounded, but these are only the official figures of cases that have been referred to the hospitals. No less than double that number were wounded but never checked into a hospital because the enemy fines anyone whose name is found on hospital records. Over 30 martyrs have fallen in the past few weeks, and thousands have been thrown in jail. Our people are continuing their struggle despite all this brutality and oppression because struggle against occupation is their duty and their conviction, regardless of the circumstances.

The situation in the Arab world is bad; it is full of fragmentation and peppered with weakness, demoralization and despair. But in their uprising, our people in the occupied territories are full of optimism, because they feel that through their sacrifices they are issuing a powerful call to the Arab nation to recognize the nature of the danger posed to it, to realize what black fate awaits the Arabs if they do not wake up to the danger which the Israelis pose to every handspan of our Arab land.

By rebelling as they are, our people are giving the Arab nation a lesson. Palestinian children, saying goodbye to fear and hesitation, are picking up stones and attacking heavily armed soldiers, knowing that they may be killed. The fear factor has been eliminated, the very word "fear" has been crossed out of the Palestinian people's dictionary as they face up to Israel's military terrorism. We hear about the mother who walks up to an Israeli soldier and strangles him with her scarf. We hear about a group of women storming an Israeli army center and killing several soldiers. We hear about a simple Palestinian farmer getting hold of a knife and attacking a heavily armed Israeli patrol, killing some of its members before he himself is killed.

This is the picture which the Palestinian people present to the Arab nation, so that all the other Arabs can in turn bid fear of Israel farewell and stop hesitating to do their duty. Our people know that their struggle is creating new facts which will pave the way to Arab realization of the nature of what is happening. Although Arab fragmentation is still more powerful than all these events at the moment, the Palestinians are confident, as they continue to lay down their lives, that the Arab nation will wake up some day and recognize the Israeli danger.

On the international level, our people in the interior know that every move they make -- every strike, every demonstration, every action -- is echoing around the world. Public opinion in all parts of Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and even in the heart of U.S. society, is watching the popular Palestinian uprising and recognizing its implications: first, that this people rejects Israeli occupation; second, that all Israeli projects are rejected by this people; third, that the Palestinian people in the occupied territories are one unified whole; fourth, that the Israeli military authorities' attempts to create alternatives and collaborators are a failure; and fifth, that this popular movement is an expression of the Palestinian people's adherence to the PLO in its leadership and its forces.

[Question] But would you agree that the Arab world's failure to react has robbed the developments in the occupied territories of much of the impact they would otherwise have had on the world?

[Answer] That is true. The present reality in the Arab world is having a negative effect not only on the struggle in the occupied territories but also on the Palestinian cause as a whole and on all Arab causes in general. The Arab voice that is being heard in the world today is a weak one.

[Question] What makes you think the Palestinian uprising will sooner or later wake the Arabs up when we all know that not even Israeli thrusts deep into the Arab world, including an attack on Baghdad, did not wake them up?

[Answer] Our duty and the duty of our people is to continue the struggle against occupation, even if we were on a remote island, cut off from any possibility of Arab support. We must continue the confrontation, and as we struggle, we are confident that many of the present circumstances will change. If they do not change now, they will change in the next stage.

The deteioration of conditions in the Arab world does not mean that we must stop our struggle. On the contary, we must continue to struggle and sacrifice, even if we have to do it alone, knowing that the sentiments of all the Arab people are with us, although sentiments alone are not enough.

[Question] How do you explain the Israeli Labor Party's failure to withdraw confidence from the Begin government for its treatment of the people in the occupied territories?

[Answer] it is true that we are now suffering at the hands of Likud under the leadership of Begin, Sharon and Shamir, but we must not forget what the Palestinian and Arab cause suffered at the hands of the Israeli Labor Party, which led the Israeli entity from its inception until the Likud took over. They are the ones who applied the polices of aggression and occupation in 1948, 1956 and 1967; they are the ones who started the policy of settlements in the occupied territories; and they are the ones who started the "long arm" policy.

There is no difference between Labor and Likud. Any tactical differences they may have are for use in their internal political struggles only. When we see the (Shimon) Peres group adopt a posture of opposition to the Likud government, we must realize that the posture is motivated by domestic political considerations and does not indicate a return to conscience and principles or the beginning of political change.

Thus, when Begin soyght a national coalition government in preparation for an all-out attack on the south, Peres' refusal to enter the coalition was due to party considerations: He feared that a victory in such an operation would establish the Begin government so firmly in power that it would abort any future Labor attempt to return to power. These domestic struggles apart, they are all in favor of liquidating the Palestinians, of destroying the power of the PLO, of continuing the policy of military occupation and settlement. Nevertheless, we say that even these minor domestic differences within Israeli society are important.

[Question] Going back to south Lebanon, do you believe that America's interests coincide with Israel's interest in escalating the situation in south Lebanon, now that the Israelis have withdrawn from Sinai?

[Answer] Our view of U.S. policy is that it gives first priority to the interests, defense and strengthening of the Israeli entity. The American Government is always bolstering Israel's capabilities and providing Israel with the latest American weapons -- not to mention the American-Israeli strategic agreement, which Sharon is now going to Washington to discuss and develop.

As for encouraging the Israeli Government to attack, the U.S. has a long history of supporting Israel, or submitting to Israeli blackmail, in its policy of aggression on south Lebanon or any other Arab target -- as demonstrated by the Israeli attack on the nuclear reactor in Baghdad or the Israeli attempt to attack the Syrian missiles in the Al-Biqa' or the expected Israeli operations against south Lebanon. The U.S. supports the Israeli Government in its aggressive policy, even though there may be times when American interests dictate the postponement of some Israeli operation to keep Washington from being overtaken by unplanned repercussions in the region.

We must not make the mistake of thinking that Israeli and American policies are not fused together. The Reagan administration's support of every Israeli step has reached such a level that the U.S. has voted every resolution to condemn Israeli aggression, even Israel's attack on the Al-Aqsa Mosque. This is an embodiment of the nature of American policy, which supports and adopts the Israeli line in everything.

[Question] What does the PLO expect from the Soviet Union in the event of an Israeli invasion of south Lebanon?

[Answer] In any future Israeli operation, we will depend first and foremost on ourselves and the joint Lebanese-Palestinian forces. We must develop our capability and strengthen ourselves daily, and this is what we have been doing for a long time now: increasing our military capabilities. If the battle comes, we must do our duty in confronting the attack and defending ourselves and south Lebanon.

As for who may stand with us, the circumstances of the battle will determine whether or not some Arab parties participate — depending on the nature, scope and objectives of the Israeli military operation. In other words, if the Israeli attack is also aimed at some Arab areas, those Arab parties will make a move.

Regarding the Soviet Union's position, we are always confident that the Soviet Union is a friend that will take political action to try to limit the aggression and will work with other international quarters to keep the situation from escalating. Naturally, we do not expect Soviet military participation, but we do expect political moves that contribute to the limitation of the aggression. We must not forget that the Soviet Union is a friend that always expresses its support for the PLO, for the struggle of our people and for their right to establish their own independent state on their national soil. The Soviet Union can help on the political level, but we do not expect Soviet military participation.

[Question] How long will it take the Palestinian forces to be able to pose a threat to raiding Israeli planes and bring them down?

[Answer] We are constantly working to develop our weapons, and the Israelis themselves admit that our air defense equipment has improved a great deal. Thus, in their latest raids, their targets were some of our anti-aircraft weapons.

The improvement of those weapons helps in may ways. For instance, it prevents raiding planes from coming down too low, which reduces their chances of hitting the target. In the last two raids, the enemy admitted that our anti-aircraft defenses were very effective, robbing him of the maneuver ability he used to have in the past. The acquisition of more advanced anti-aircraft weapons depends on several factors, including the material factor — the financial means — and the political factors that may or may not allow us to acquire such weapons. We are trying on those two levels to gain the capability of acquiring those advanced weapons, although we know that what we have now is far more advanced than what we used to have.

[Question] Have you despaired of the Arabs' ability to come up with a unified Arab strategy for the defense of south Lebanon?

[Answer] It's not a matter of despair; we in the Palestinian Revolution don't recognize the word "despair." Our most effective weapon is optimism and our logic is that our struggle must continue until the circumstances change.

Regarding the possibility of a unified Arab strategy on Lebanon, that really depends on the possibility of a comprehensive Arab strategy. When circumstances make a unified Arab position possible, the Arab conception of the southern issue will automatically become one. Now, however, the Arabs have many conceptions on all issues, due to the current Arab fragmentation.

We do not believe it is possible to achieve a joint Arab strategy of confrontation in Lebanon at this point -- although we in the Palestinian Revolution are clearly in favor of any step that involves a unified Arab strategy on any Arab issue, especially the issue of south Lebanon. We always support joint Arab action. We always favor any Arab meeting, any Arab agreement, any Arab strategy. That is our constant policy.

[Question] Now, however, the Arab world is divided. Some are saying that the Arab world is splitting into two axes -- one led by Egypt and one supporting Iran. How does this affect the Palestinian Revolution?

[Answer] There is no doubt that any battle that breaks out in the Arab world effects the nature of the confrontation with the Israeli enemy. All the side-battles going on in various parts of the Arab world are affecting the Arab nation's ability to confront this enemy, whose target is every part of the Arab world and who is determined to subdue the Arab nation, setting himself up as the master and turning all the rest into slaves to his policy. That is why we have always tried to put out any fire that breaks out in any part of the Arab world.

The latest fire is the Iraqi-Iranian war, in which we consider the Palestinian cause to be the biggest loser. The Palestinian cause is the biggest loser in any side-battle in the Arab world, because the confrontation with the Israeli enemy requires the concentration of every bit of Arab capability against that enemy. The Israeli enemy can't be more pleased when he sees side-battles breaking out in the Arab world, because he is counting on our division and fragmentation, which is his greatest weapon.

Look at the facts underscored by the 1973 war, when Arab unity, despite the ulterior motives which some had, shook the Israeli entity to its foundations. Immediately after that war, Israeli analysts and journalists began to argue in favor of playing for time: They were counting on the time element to fragment the Arabs again and enable Israel to achieve its designs. And they were right. Arab fragmentation was not long in coming, and it continued and increased until we found ourselves in our present situation. But despite all this, we still have confidence in the strength of the Arab will. The day will come when we will wake up to find the Arab nation closing ranks to become one unified whole facing the Zionist danger.

[Question] Would you explain to us the role of the Palestinian resistance in the recent violence in Tripoli?

[Answer] We consider any side-battle a blow to our ability to confront the Zionist enemy, and we are anxious to see the situation in Lebanon stabilize. We want all Lebanese problems to disappear, because whenever any of those problems flares up, it diverts our attention from the duty of continuing our preparations to confront the constant Zionist aggression.

In Tripoli, the Palestinians have nothing to do with the incidents or their escalation. On the contrary, we are interested in nipping in the bud any potential deterioration. As a result of the moves made by the high committees formed, which were consecrated in the presence of our brother Abu 'Ammar (PLO chief Yasir 'Arafat), (National Movement Secretary General) Muhsin Ibrahim and Tripoli's nationalist leader at the residence of (former) Premier Rashid Karami, certain solutions have been secured for this problem, which some parties try to stir up from time to time to serve their various interests.

Some have been drawing a link between the incidents in Tripoli and the Palestinian-Syrian relationship, and this has started rumors that there are Palestinian-Syrian differences which have reached the stage of deterioration and raised the possibility of a return to the atmosphere of 1976 (when the PLO clashed with the Syrian troops entering Lebanon).

Those who are spreading such rumors are greatly mistaken, because the position of the Palestinian Revolution is that regardless of the circumstances, it is not in Syria's interests nor in the Palestinians' interests nor in the interests of the Arabs in general to see a return to that horrible nightmare, those dark days of our nation's history which witnessed the incidents of 1976 and all their tragedies.

Especially in the present difficult circumstances, in which we are facing an unrelenting Israeli assault under the banner of Camp David, we consider that we cannot do without a unified position with Syrian, Lebanon's nationalist forces and the steadfastness states.

This is absolutely necessary if we are to confront the new and horrible conspiracies which are approaching us and which will be worse than Camp David.

The relationship between the Palestinians, Syria and the Lebanese nationalist forces must be a natural, complementary relationship. That is why the Palestinian National Liberation Movement, Fatah, has insisted on maintaining a constant, frank dialogue in bilateral committees which have studied ways of clearing our path of any element whch can affect our relations -- taking into consideration the circumstances and interests of each party in a context of continuous coordination on the basis of joint national struggle against the Zionist and the imperialist enemy.

Our common goals, or common dangers, our common destiny, and our common need to close ranks -- all these make it imperative that we view matters with open eyes, vigilant minds and total commitment to the issues and goals of destiny which we hold in common. And if, along the way, we come across certain conceptions or partial differences, regardless of the reasons and the interpretations, it is essential that we step over them quickly and leave their effects behind us so that we can continue our trek together.

That is our conviction in Fatah and the PLO. That is what we want, and what all the sincere elements in Syria, Lebanon and Palestine want. In this context, we emphasize that we see nothing that justifies concern in our relations with Syria, because in every meeting with the Syrian leadership, we discuss all new developments frankly, anxious to deal with any problem that crops up without delay, before it can have repercussions due to the complex current situation, which is teeming with the new interactions in Lebanon and the Arab world.

Our clear view of the importance of this relationship, of the gravity of the present circumstances and of the need for unity prompts us to reaffirm our interest in keeping this relationship sound, maintaining its natural progress and exerting possible effort to deepen it. That is what we are constantly trying to do, and other approach is rejected.

PLO EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETS UNDER 'ARAFAT

NC270850 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 0645 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] The PLO Executive Committee met yesterday under Brother Commander Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat]. The committee reviewed the outcome of the visit brother Abu 'Ammar and the accompanying Palestinian delegation paid to India and Pakistan. It also reviewed the outcome of the meeting between Brother Commander Abu 'Ammar and Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu in Damascus the day before yesterday.

The Executive Committee reviewed the situation inside the occupied homeland and the means of strengthening our people's steadfastness against the Zionist occupation. It also reviewed the work of the joint Palestinian-Jordanian committee.

The Executive Committee affirmed its previous decision to declare a general mobilization. It also adopted a number of measures and resolutions to confront all eventualities in the light of the recent Israeli threats and military concentrations.

SAUDI ARABIA

CROWN PRINCE FAHD COMMENTS ON REGIONAL ISSUES

LD261036 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 0715 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Riyadh, 26 May (APS) -- His Royal Highness Prince Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, crown prince and deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, stressed that the continuation or extension of the Iraq-Iran war will only be at the expense of the region's stability and safety. He said emphasis must be placed on peaceful efforts, because the alternative will be the destruction of the sources of power in the region that will incapacitate it and distract it from the real danger threatening the whole Arab nation.

In an interview published today in AR-RIYAD, his royal highness went on to say that the continuation of the Iraq-Iran war is the most prominent threat to the stability of the region in the present circumstances. He stressed [word indistinct] the stands adopted by the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council to establish peace and stop the bloodshed between Iraq and Iran. He referred to the active contacts currently taking place on various levels in an attempt to reach a joint position to put an end to this war. He explained that the initiative of His Highness Shaykh Zayid ibn Sultan Al Nuhayyan, UAE president, the emergency meeting of the foreign ministers of the Gulf Cooperation Council countries and the foreign minister's tour all took place within this framework.

With regard to whether there is a Saudi or an Arab move to cordon off the Zionist enemy and prevent its return to African Cairo, His Royal Highness Prince Fahd declared that the kingdom's reaction to Zaire's decision to restore relations with Israel was speedy. He said there must be a decisive and speedy Arab and Islamic move against the step taken by the Government of Zaire in order to prevent a return by Israel to Africa.

His Royal Highness Prince Fahd explained that the links between the Arabs and Africa are greater than financial assistance. Moreover, cooperation between them is comprehensive and diversified. There are longstanding ties in the struggle against colonialism and all forms of racial discrimination, and there is coincidence in political and economic interests and in their positions as developing people trying to rebuild their societies in order to achieve their development for the wellbeing of their sons.

His royal highness drew attention to the fact that as Africa is conscious of the Israeli danger it is protecting itself and preventing the danger from penetrating into its structure. Moreover, when Zaire and other African countries broke off relations with Israel, they were convinced of this and expressed their displeasure with the continued Israeli occupation of Arab and Palestinian territory and its denial of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to their land and homeland.

The crown prince and deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers wondered what caused Zaire to change its position and depart from the resolutions of African and African-Arab summit conferences, UN resolutions and the nonaligned states' resolution and asked whether Israel has given up its occupation of Arab and Palestinian territory. His royal highness said the reason Zaire severed relations still exist and hence there is no justification for Zaire's step.

Prince Fahd called for Arab and Muslim activity to confront the Zionist attempts to infiltrate once again the African Continent. He pointed out that in order not to relinquish the basic principles of our cause we must increase the spheres of cooperation with Africa according to a studied strategy, and should continue to expose and confront the Zionist plans.

His royal highness called on the Arab nation to deal with its problems and close ranks in order to be able to deal with the challenges it is facing, especially the danger of the continuing Israeli occupation, its persistent aggression and neverending expansion.

Prince Fahd said our Arab nation is going through difficult times weighed down by events that require greater unity, solidarity, cohesion and more effort to resolve disputes than at any time before in order to achieve the level of responsibility required at this fateful stage. He went added that although Israel recently evacuated the Sinai, it still occupies the West Bank and Gaza Strip, has annexed holy Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan Heights and is continuing its hostile activities against our people in the occupied land and against the holy places. Moreover, the Iraq-Iran war continues, causing more damage and danger and threatening the whole region.

Prince Fahd expressed hope that it will not be long before the U.S. administration takes forceful steps to effect the Israeli withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the establishment of an independent Palestinian state. He said it has been proved that without these two things the region will continue to suffer unrest and tension.

Regarding the purpose of his visit to the United States, his royal highness said everything will be announced at the right time.

Regarding his royal highness' assessment of the Gulf Cooperation Council 1 year after its establishment, he stressed that the Council has proved its effectiveness and positiveness and has succeeded in embodying the Arab homeland. It expresses their solid stand and limits responsibility for their security to their own states, and acts as a bulwark against attempts by the superpowers to interfere in the affairs of the region. His royal highness mentioned that through its organs the council has been able to coordinate its efforts in all vital political, economic, social, cultural and security spheres for the well-being of the region and in the interests of the causes of the Arab and Islamic nations. He described the council's achievements as many and said they speak for themselves. Moreover, they are appreciated by, and receive the confidence of, the countries and peoples of the council.

Regarding the current situation in Lebanon, Prince Fahd expressed regret at what is happening there every day. He also expressed his belief that the basic step toward settling the Lebanese crisis is, first of all, for the Lebanese to come to an understanding among themselves and for harmony to prevail among them. He stressed the kindgom's desire to establish security and stability in Lebanon and its continued offer of every assistance in order that Lebanon may rise from its stagnation, since the easing of the situation in Lebanon will have a positive effect on the whole region.

ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT VIEWS IRAQ-IRAN WAR

PM261617 London ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT in Arabic 26 May 82 p 1

[Chief editor 'Irfan Nizam ad-Din report: "What Follows Iraq's Withdrawal From Al-Muhammarah (Khorramshahr)?"]

[Excerpts] London -- Many questions were raised in every Arab capital and in the capitals of major powers following the rapid developments in the Iraq-Iran war and the announcement by Iraq regarding the completion of its withdrawal of forces from Al-Muhammarah [Khorramshahr] to the international borders existing prior to the outbreak of war in September 1980. The most persistent questions center on one principal point: Has the war entered its final stages preparatory to a peaceful solution, or has it reached new beginnings more dangerous and explosive, and in which new factors and other parties will become involved?

The intensive contacts that took place yesterday between the Arab countries in general and the Gulf states in particular sought particularly to explore the road and determine future steps in the midst of definite reports about a long, hot summer in the area that could lead to changes in may balances as well as in alliances.

ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT has learned a number of Arab countries have in fact begun contacts with Iraqi President Saddam Husayn in order to hear a realistic evaluation of the military situation from him before taking any practical steps. Agreement was reached on exchanging high-level visits "on the level of developments," as one prominent Arab official said, for it is feared that Israel might take this opportunity to deal its expected blow against southern Lebanon and the Palestinian resistance.

It was also learned that contacts included certain major powers, including the United States and West European countries, which have shown great interest in the situation after watching the Iraq-Iran war with caution but without great concern as long as it remained between the two countries and did not spill over to neighboring countries.

The well-informed sources did not rule out the possibility of convening an urgent meeting of the Arab foreign ministers if it proves impossible to hold a summit because of increasing differences between the Arab countries, in order to discuss the situation frankly with a view to "testing" the joint Arab defense pact.

But what are the possibilities of the coming stage? Most Arab official and diplomatic quarters speak about two major possibilities (barring internal events in one of the parties that might reverse the situation). These are:

1. The possibility that the Iranian leaders might not be satisfied with what the war has achieved so far and might bring military pressure on Iraq to force it to surrender (some quarters talk about trying to attack Basra or An-Najaf, for example), by crossing the international borders between the two countries and shifting the battle into Iraq at the insistence of the regime's extremist wing.

Iraqi circles scoff at this possibility, saying the Iraqi Army has set up massive fortifications to defend its territory and has concentrated five divisions fully armed with modern weapons. These quarters say the difference between the recent battles and any battle taking place inside the borders would be great, in that hitherto the Iraqi soldier was fighting on foreign soil the Iraqi leadership said it did not intend to keep, while in the latter case he will be defending his country and therefore the morale and strategy will differ.

Meanwhile, highly-placed Arab sources confirmed to ASH-SHARQ AL-AWSAT that several Arab countries have officially warned Iran that they will not stand idly by if it crosses Iraqi borders and that they will be forced to enter the war on Iraq's side regardless of the consequences. The sources also said similar warnings have been given by Islamic and Western countries, including the United States. This was confirmed when an official U.S. source said that official contacts were held with several area countries, including Turkey, Pakistan and Indonesia, to deal with any development that might affect the stability and security of the Gulf area and the oilfields in particular.

In this regard, several Pakistani naval units have begun exercises in the Gulf and the chief of the Turkish general staff is touring several Gulf countries.

Islamic Mediation

2. The second possibility is that the war might stop at Khorramshahr (while minor clashes and desultory fighting might continue), in which case the various mediation efforts, foremost of which is the Islamic mediation, will have the opportunity to continue.

Despite Khomeyni's warnings to some Arab countries yesterday, Iranian Ambassador to Pakistan 'Abbas Zanini affirmed that the Iranian forces will not enter Iraqi territory, but said the Iranians will not negotiate on what he called postwar matters with President Saddam Husayn's government. The Iranian ambassador admitted Iraqi forces still occupy some parts of the country on the western front.

On the other hand the optimists assert that recent developments have automatically removed the main stumbling block to the success of mediation, which is Iran's condition that Iraqi forces withdraw before any peaceful negotiations. In fact, some people go to the extent of saying the Iraqi command has facilitated the task of the Islamic Good Offices Committee by regrouping its forces on the borders, after realizing the war would continue forever if the Iraqi forces remained in the positions they had occupied since a month after the war began.

It is therefore expected that the Islamic committee will shortly move toward taking its historic and decisive decision. This would be after its meeting in Jidda scheduled for 5 and 6 June.

YAR

FORMER MINISTER RECEIVES 10-YEAR PRISON TERM

JN261820 San'a' Domestic Service in Arabic 1700 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The Supreme State Security Court held a special session this morning under its president, Al-Qadi 'Abdallah Rajih, to announce its verdict on the case referred to it by the public prosecutor against the accused, [former Minister] 'Abdallah 'Abd al-Majid al-Asnaj, on the charges brought against him. The court announced the verdict in the presence of the accused.

The Supreme State Security Court sentenced the above-mentioned accused to a 10-year prison term on the basis of his written and verbal confessions before the court to the charges brought against him and under Article 4 of Law No 22 of 1963 concerning crimes harming public security.

The sentence was referred to the brother president of the republic and commander in chief of the armed forces for consideration in accordance with the law.

MUBARAK INTERVIEWED ON ARAB UNITY, IRAQ-IRAN WAR

NC262306 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2210 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- President Husni Mubarak has said that what is taking place in the Arab arena requires a united Arab stance and that existing fears are unjustified. He also spoke of the Iraq-Iran war. He expressed his belief that Iran will stop at its international border, because it realizes that crossing the border means an imbalance in the scales of the international, regional and Arab interest network.

In an interview by Ahmad al-Jarallah, editor in chief of the Kuwaiti newspaper AS-SIYASAH, which is published in tomorrow's issue of AL-AHRAM, he added that Egypt is carefully watching the situation and that he has had contacts with various parties concerned about the situation. He also said Egypt has provided Iraq with its ammunition and weapons needs, but it does not have troops there.

President Mubarak spoke of Egypt's role in reuniting Arab ranks, saying: We do not want to embarrass anyone, for we have a different political line and a line which is subject to change now and then. He added we should first put an end to the deterioration of Arab relations prevailing now.

The president clarified that Egypt's friendship with the United States is within the framework of our domestic and national interests, without affecting our domestic sovereignty. He added the facilities granted to the United States are temporary and within the framework of conditions agreed upon.

KUNA Report on Interview

LD270848 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 0709 GMT 27 May 82

[Excerpts] Kuwait, 27 May (KUNA) -- Egyptian President Husni Mubarak today declared that his country [word indistinct] any Iranian penetration into Iraqi territory and warned that this would mean disturbing the intermingled interests in the sensitive strategic Arabian Gulf region. He said Egypt is closely watching the situation on the battlefront between Iraq and Iran, and made contacts with international parties on this issue; but he did not name these parties.

The Egyptian president said -- in a statement published by the Kuwaiti newspaper AS-SIYASAH and the English-language ARAB TIMES -- our estimation points to the fact that Iran will stop at the international border with Iraq because it realizes that any border violation means disturbing the network of interests in the region, whether international, regional or Arab interest. He said Iran rejects Iraq's encroachment into its territory, and an Iranian encroachment into Iraqi territory will be rejected by us. He added his government is closely watching the situation and international contacts will be made with those concerned. The Egyptian president warned that changing the regime in Iraq would not be in the region's interest because this could mean facing an unknown political leadership which may not resolve the question of peace in the region. He expressed his conviction that foreign assistance to Iran changed the balance of the Iraq-Iran war and said such assistance came from foreign countries which he did not name.

President Mubarak repeated that Egypt gave Iraq everything it needed in terms of weapons and ammunition in order for Iraq to defend itself and after he discovered that weapons were pouring into the other side. He added: We did not participate militarily, but there is a very large Egyptian community in Iraq and there may be Egyptian volunteers. We definitely did not send Egyptian soldiers.

President Mubarak also warned that it is the aim [of some] to see the oil-rich Gulf region passing through a war of attrition, from which foreign sides will benefit and in which the region will be the only victim. He said statements made by the Iranians about changing the regime in Iraq are part of psychological warfare which usually intensifies after circumstances similar to those of the Iraq-Iran war. He warned the Iranian political leadership against any illogical demand it may put forward as a result of elation following its army's progress.

ROMANIAN MINISTER ANDREI, 'ALI HOLD TALKS 26 MAY

NC261502 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1310 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- The official talks between Egypt and Romania under the chairmanship of Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali and Romanian Foreign Minister Stefan Andrei began at the Egyptian Foreign Ministry at noon today.

The talks began with a meeting between the two ministers followed by an expanded meeting attended on the Egyptian side by Foreign Ministry Under Secretary 'Umar ash-Shafi'i; director of the East European Department Muhammad Sa'id as-Sayyid; director of the Foreign Ministry Economic Affairs Department Mukhlis Jabhah; Egyptian Ambassador in Bucharest Wafiq Husni; Foreign Ministry official spokesman Ra'uf Ghunaym and advisers Muhammad 'Asim and Mrs Samirah Mahmud. The talks were attended on the Romanian side by members of the delegation accompanying the Romanian foreign minister and Romanian Ambassador in Cairo Ion Iosefide.

At the beginning of the talks 'Ali reviewed the close relations between Egypt and Romania, noting the old and strong relations existing between the two countries. He then explained the current conditions in the Middle East, the developments of the peace process and the obstacles facing the autonomy negotiations and Egypt's position toward them and its full adherence to the rights of the Palestinian people.

'Ali also dealt with the situation on the Iraqi-Iranian border and Egypt's position toward the conflict between the two countries and the need to put an end to bloodshed and to prevent any negative repercussions on the general situation in the area. 'Ali then reviewed the Arab relations and their link with the Iraqi-Iranian war as well as the situation in Africa, particularly the problem of Chad and the Sahara conflict and Egypt's total concern for the unity of the OAU.

'Ali also explained Egypt's position in the Nonaligned Movement and the Group of 77 and its complete readiness to cooperate for a greater effectiveness and activity in these two spheres.

Romanian Foreign Minister Stefan Andrei reviewed Romania's position on recent international developments, noting that the restoration of all of Egypt's territories is considered an important precedent in international relations for solving disputes by peaceful means. Andrei explained the Romanian viewpoint on settling the Middle East situation and solving the Palestinian problem to achieve security and stability in the area.

The Romanian side also reviewed the developments of the North-South dialogue and the need for the developing states to unite their stands and proposed in this regard that a summit conference of the heads of developing states be held.

MENA has learned that the Egyptian side expressed its full appreciation for the Romanian proposal to convene a summit conference of the heads of developing states and promised to study the proposal and to hold consultations between the two countries in this regard. The two sides agreed on the need to promote relations between the two countries in the various fields and to continue discussing the various aspects of the relations with the ministers concerned.

MENA has also learned that the Romanian foreign minister renewed Romania's previous proposal to convene an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations to be attended by all the parties to the Middle East dispute, including the PLO and the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to work for the establishment of comprehensive and permanent peace in the Middle East and for a solution to the conflict in the area. The Romanian minister expressed his country's appreciation for Egypt's efforts for the achievement of peace.

The Romanian side affirmed the importance of bolstering the close relations between Egypt and Romania, particularly in the economic and commercial spheres.

MENA has also learned that 'Ali reaffirmed Egypt's interest, after it had regained the Sinai, to extend the framework of peace to cover the whole area. He also affirmed this cannot be achieved without achieving a just solution to the Palestinian problem, which is the basis of the Middle East conflict.

'Ali Speaks at Luncheon

NC261619 Cairo Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 26 May 82

[Excerpts] Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali today gave a luncheon in honor of Romanian Foreign Minister Stefan Andrei.

During the luncheon, 'Ali said Egypt's recovery of the Sinai and exercising its sovereignty over all its territory is considered one of the most important positive developments the Middle East has recently witnessed, since it provided proof of the courage and correctness of Egypt's policy.

'Ali said comprehensive peace will not be achieved without the achievement of a just solution of the Palestinian problem, which is considered the crux of the Middle East conflict. Egypt believes the first step toward settling this problem could be through the establishment of a transitional system in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip under which the Palestinian people in the occupied land will exercise full and genuine autonomy that would be the prelude to the Palestinian people exercising their right of self-determination and settling all aspects of the Palestinian issue. He said Egypt has been working for some time and is confident about the possibility of continuing efforts to achieve a declaration of principles governing the establishment of this transitional system acceptable to the Palestinians, whose issue has been linked with the struggle of the Egyptian people. 'Ali affirmed that Egypt does not speak on behalf of the Palestinians and will not impose on them solutions that they do not accept.

Regarding the Iraqi-Iranian war, 'Ali said it is one of the negative factors threatening the Middle East. He said Egypt's policy has always been to condemn this war and to call for ending it and settling the dispute through negotiations. He said if Egypt has recently taken a position in favor of assisting one of the parties to the dispute, this did not stem from enmity toward the other side but to create suitable conditions to put an end to the bloodshed on both sides and to settle the conflict between them through negotiations and dialogue ultimately achieving the two peoples' interests. 'Ali praised Egyptian-Romanian relations.

Andrei Speaks at Luncheon

NC261941 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1723 GMT 26 May 82

[Excerpt] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- In his reply to Foreign Minister Kamal Hasan 'Ali's speech at a luncheon today, Romanian Foreign Minister Stefan Andrei declared Romania firmly supports a peaceful settlement of the Middle East conflict that could lead to just and permanent peace based on Israeli withdrawal from all Arab lands occupied since the 1967 war, including Arab Jerusalem, and on resolving the Palestinian problem on the basis of the recognition of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination and to establish their own independent state and guaranteeing the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of all the states in the area.

In this regard, the Romanian foreign minister called for the intensification of the political and diplomatic efforts for the convening of an international conference with the active participation and under the auspices of the United Nations to be attended by all the parties to the dispute, including the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and with the participation of the Soviet Union and the United States and other states which can make an effective contribution toward a solution of the dispute.

Andrei expressed the Romanian people's happiness for the Egyptian people's accomplishment and the achievement of their aspirations for peace and prosperity and the restoration of all their lands after the final Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai. He also praised the positive development in Romanian-Egyptian relations in the past few years, which was manifested in particular in the expansion of the bilateral economic cooperation. He expressed his country's satisfaction with the existing cooperation between Egypt and Romania within the framework of the United Nations and other organizations.

Andrei pointed out that the volume of the economic exchange between Egypt and Romania rose to $500 million in 1980. He expressed the hope that the relations between the two countries will continue to develop and acquire new dimensions of stability.

The Romanian foreign minister affirmed that his country under President Nicolae Ceausescu is struggling in an effective manner to overcome the present tense conditions and to arrive at decisive steps in the field of comprehensive nuclear disarmament and to adopt tangible measures to end underdevelopment, establish a new international economic system and restore the policy of detente.

Andrei Meets Muhyi ad-Din

NC261948 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1928 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- During this meeting with Romanian Foreign Minister Stefan Andrei this evening, Prime Minister Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din discussed aspects of cooperation between the two countries in various spheres.

The Romanian minister, on behalf of his country's prime minister, addressed an invitation to Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din to visit Romania. He also expressed his government's satisfaction for the complete liberation of the Sinai. He added: This is considered an example for resolving international problems and the pursuit of peace.

REACTION TO COSTA RICAN EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM

NC262330 Cairo MENA in Arabic 2210 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- AL-AHRAM reports in tomorrow's issue that Egypt has had contacts with the head of the group of the Latin American states in Cairo [ra'is majmu'at duwal Amrika al-Latiniyah fi al-Wahirah] as well as with the Costa Rican Government, through its embassy there, to clarify Egypt's stance on the Costa Rican Government's transferring of its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

The paper says Egypt does not recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital nor does it recognize Israel's recent decision to annex Jerusalem. All the states in the world had earlier taken a united stand on transferring their embassies from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem following the annexation of Jerusalem and its designation as a united capital of Israel.

Egypt has thoroughly explained its viewpoint to the Costa Rican Government regarding the transfer of its embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

ABU GHAZALAH INTERVIEWED ON IRAN-IRAQ WAR

GF260505 Jidda AL-MADINAH in Arabic 23 May 82 p 10

[Interview granted by Egyptian Minister of Defense and War Production Field Marshal 'Abd al-Halim Abu Ghazalah to AL-MADINAH correspondent Sayid Ahmad Khalifah in Khartoum on 20 May]

[Excerpts] AL-MADINAH: President Husni Mubarak has spoken several times about threats to Gulf security, expressing Egypt's readiness to contribute to the Gulf defense. What is the source of the threat to the Gulf security, in your opinion?

Abu Ghazalah: Egypt considers Gulf security as part of its own security and the security of the entire Arab nation. This security is subject to many external threats. Therefore, we are very much concerned with this issue. We are studying this and are trying to find the means of strengthening Arab Gulf security. We hope the Arab nation will find the right means for that purpose.

AL-MADINAH: Do you think these threats are from within the area or are they the result of the ambitions of the superpowers?

Abu Ghazalah: It is understood that the threats to Gulf security are external threats, of course. They are the results of the ambitions and objectives of many external forces trying to engulf the Arab Gulf from all sides, either to maintain their strategic interests or to threaten others, interests by tightening the grip around them or to obtain more Arab oil in the future and according to their own conditions. I don't want to call things by their names, because, as you know, I am severely criticized by a number of the Gulf information media, particularly in Kuwait. However, in my view, Gulf security is subject to external threats caused by many great forces, and the second threat is from Khomeyni and his revolution, which represents a direct danger to the security of the Gulf and the stability of the Arab region.

AL-MADINAH: To what extent is Egypt ready to help Iraq in its war with Iran?

Abu Ghazalah: Forget about this question.

AL-MADINAH: But both the Iraqi and Egyptian sides have spoken about contacts and cooperation between them in the military field. That is why the question is important.

Abu Ghazalah: Egypt is part of the Arab nation and hopes for this nation's victory in all its battles against enemies and greedy forces.

AL-MADINAH: Then by saying so you are thinking that the war between Iran and Iraq is a war launched by an external force against the Arab nation.

Abu Ghazalah: Yes. Any war between an Arab side and another force is a threat to the whole Arab nation.

AL-MADINAH: Does this apply to any war between Israel and the Palestinians, the Syrians, the Jordanians or others?

Abu Ghazalah: I repeat that any war between an Arab side and another country is a threat to the security of the Arab nation and consequently, Egypt together with others, will try to establish peace in the whole Arab world. Nobody wants war and nobody supports it. This also includes the Iran-Iraq war. Egypt hopes this war will stop and the two Islamic countries of Iran and Iraq will agree to peace.

AL-MADINAH: Has the military tension on the Egyptian-Libyan border ended?

Abu Ghazalah: There are no problems on these borders at the moment and therefore, there are no troubles now, because the Egyptian supreme policy is not to respond to anyone and to bring about an atmosphere of stability in the Arab world.

This is the policy which Husni Mubarak has announced and we all stick to it. We hope matters will become normal as they were in the past between all brother Arabs.

AL-MADINAH: There are very optimistic reports about Egypt's return to the Arab fold. How does Egypt view that and what are its conditions for this return?

Abu Ghazalah: Egypt sets no conditions for its return and does not accept conditions from anyone. But, as President Husni Mubarak has declared, Egypt is open for anyone who wants to reestablish relations with it.

AL-MADINAH: Do you have any information about a Soviet bias toward Iran regarding the Gulf war?

Abu Ghazalah: I don't have accurate information about this matter.

AL-MADINAH: To what extent is it true that there are Palestinian-Egyptian talks?

Abu Ghazalah: I do not have accurate information about this matter either. I have been busy recently with military matters and have not been involved in diplomatic or political activities.

AL-MADINAH: What are the military matters which have occupied you recently?

Abu Ghazalah: Maneuvers and military exercises.

AL-MADINAH: What is the value and significance of the Egyptian Army maneuvers during what you call peace with the direct enemy, Israel?

Abu Ghazalah: We always believe that peace chould not mean military relaxation. We believe Egypt, in spite of peace, is still surrounded by danger. Therefore, we believe the Egyptian Armed Forces should be capable of repelling any aggression at all times. We are following a deterrent strategy to force anyone who wants to launch an aggression against us to think twice before he does so. Therefore, our troops should possess high efficiency with regard to armament, training, preparation and morale. Preparation needs training, of course. This is the objective. We carry out military maneuvers periodically. We assume a specific kind of threat and train our troops to confront it so we will not be surprised in the future.

AL-MADINAH: How does Egypt view the Arab peace plan?

Abu Ghazalah: We are looking for peace and resolution of the Palestinian issue. Egypt says it is sticking to Camp David because it believes this is the right way to achieve peace. But, no doubt, anything that leads to establishing peace and maintaining the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people will not be rejected or refused by any wise and conscientious Arab citizen. Therefore, I say Egypt supports anything that aims at resolving the Palestinian issue, establishing peace and restoring Palestinian rights.

AL-MADINAH: How do you view the Soviet presence in Ethiopia and its threat to the neighboring countries?

Abu Ghazalah: I do not doubt that the Soviet presence in Ethiopia is a threat to the security of Sudan. We hope relations between the Soviets and Ethiopia will only be in the interest of the two countries.

AL-MADINAH: What is the most important objective of your current visit to Khartoum?

Abu Ghazalah: The most important objective of our current visit to Khartoum is coordination in military cooperation between Sudan and Egypt and reviewing some matters regarding integration. We also want to know our Sudanese brothers' demands and what Egypt can give to Sudan in any field.

PARLIAMENTARY SPEAKER TALIB DISCUSSES AUTONOMY

NC261350 Cairo MENA in English 1305 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- People's Assembly speaker Dr. Sufi Abu Talib today affirmed Egypt's commitment to work for the liberation of the occupied Arab territories and to put Palestinians on the road to autonomy.

During a meeting with the Cuban ambassador here Dr. Sufi pointed out that Egypt is not against any initiative to solve the Palestinian problem. He also pointed out that a minimum level of understanding between Egypt and the rest of the Arab world has been attained after the Israeli withdrawal from Sinai.

The meeting dealt with means to promote bilateral cooperation with an emphasis on economic and cultural aspects.

SOCIALIST LIBERAL PARTY MEETS ON IRAQ-IRAN WAR

NC261512 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1345 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Cairo, 26 May (MENA) -- The Political Bureau of the Socialist Liberal Party held a meeting today under the chairmanship of party leader Mustafa Kamil Murad.

Murad stated after the meeting the party will approach President Muhammad Husni Mubarak with a request that Egypt intervene and propose reconciliation [as-sulh] between Iraq and Iran and that an Islamic court of justice attached to the league of Islamic and Arab peoples be established to resolve disputes which may take place between Islamic states. He added that the democratic atmosphere in which Egypt is living now ensures freedom for all and freedom of party and political action.

Concluding his statement, Murad said the party Political Bureau will invite President Mubarak to visit the party to meet with a large number of party members and review the party activities.

ARMED FORCES GENERAL COMMAND COMMUNIQUE NO 723

JN261715 Baghdad Domestic Service in Arabic 1605 GMT 26 May 82

[Communique No 723 issued by the Armed Forces General Command on 26 May 1982]

[Text] In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate.

Throughout the ages, lofty Iraq will remain a solid wall in the face of aggressive and expansionist designs and a trenchant sword against the spiteful Khomeyni clique's expansionist designs and the ill-wind it brought about at the instigation of its colonial masters and in cooperation with Zionism. Iraq will oppose those who have betrayed the nation and all enemies who are seeking to threaten the Arab nation's existence, weaken and subjugate it to foreign influence and to the designs of the backward Iranian rulers.

Our valiant armed forces, who have been fighting the Iranian enemy for more than 20 months, destroying its war machine and inflicting heavy losses in men and materiel, will continue, with God's help, as they have always been, ready to wage battles against the ruling clique in Iran, to confront its evil intentions and to force it to respect the security, sovereignty and rights of Iraq and the Arab nation.

The results of the military activities last night and today are as follows:

1. Our forward units pounded enemy positions and concentrations opposite their positions in Al-Muhammarah [Khorramshahr], killing 238 Iranians and destroying 3 tanks, 2 personnel carriers, 4 vehicles, 1 excavator and 1 stockpile of ammunition.

2. All day today our valiant aircraft and helicopters carried out fierce attacks and courageous raids on enemy targets in the Al-Muhammarah area and west of the Karun River, scoring direct and effective hits, inflicting heavy losses on these targets and destroying a large number of enemy tanks, vehicles and concentrations. All our aircraft and helicopters returned safely to base.

3. One of our forward units sighted an enemy concentration opposite its positions in the Nowsud area and struck it with all kinds of weapons, killing 11 and destroying 1 gun and 2 stockpiles of ammunition.

4. Seven were killed and one 106-mm gun was destroyed in the Sar-e Pol-e Zahab area.

5. Two were killed and one vehicle carrying a 106-mm gun was destroyed in the Bostan sector.

6. One vehicle was destroyed in the 'Eyn Khosh area.

Thus, the total known enemy losses amount to 258 killed, 3 tanks, 2 personnel carriers, 2 guns, 6 vehicles -- 1 carrying a 106-mm gun -- 1 excavator and 3 stockpiles of ammunition destroyed.

[Signed] The Armed Forces General Command, 26 May 1982

PRINCE HASAN'S ACTIVITIES IN U.S. REPORTED

JN262018 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 1900 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Washington -- His Highness Crown Prince Hasan met with U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig in Washington yesterday. Later, his highness said he explained to Secretary Haig that the achievement of peace in the Middle East must be based on two main elements: The recognition of the Palestinian people's legitimate rights and peace and security for all states in the region. Referring to recent developments in the Iraqi-Iranian war, his highness reiterated Jordan's support for Iraq's legitimate rights. He affirmed that efforts are still being exerted to find adequate means and ways to end this war. He added the continuation of this war could endanger all the region's resources if it is not contained at the right time.

His highness the crown prince had attended a working breakfast hosted in his honor by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. He also met with members of the U.S. Business Affairs Institute. His highness was also guest of honor at the U.S. Middle East Institute, where he delivered a speech reviewing developments in the Middle East crisis and the concept of a just and lasting peace with regard to the Palestine question. His highness also met with the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and with Vice President George Bush. In the evening, his highness attended a reception at the Jordanian Embassy in Washington on the occasion of Independence and Army Day.

Further Report

JN261251 Amman AR-RA'Y in Arabic 26 May 82 p 1

[Text] Washington -- Crown Prince Hasan, currently visiting the United States, met for an hour with U.S. Secretary of State Alexander Haig. In a statement to reporters following his meeting, Prince Hasan said Jordan is hoping to obtain sophisticated U.S. arms and missiles. He added: We need these arms to guarantee our self-defense against any external threat.

ARMED FORCES COMMANDER DISCUSSES ARMAMENT POLICY

JN260722 Amman AL-UFUQ in Arabic 25 May 82 pp 10, 13

[Interview granted by Lt Gen ash-Sharif Zayd ibn Shakir, commander in chief of the Jordanian Armed Forces, to Maryud at-Tall, managing editor, and Tariq Masarwah, chief editor, of AL-UFUQ in Amman -- date not given]

[Excerpt] [Question] Your Excellency the commander in chief, the Jordanian Political leadership was able in the past years, and under positive conditions in the Arab world, to give the military establishment a free hand in the process of diversifying the sources of weapons. We bought from Britain, France and the USSR. Do you believe the next phase will be suitable for continuing this process? Will we continue the process of diversifying weapons sources?

[Answer] The orders of his majesty the supreme commander on the subject of diversifying weapons sources are part of his orders to build our forces on bases safeguarding Jordan's freedom to obtain the weapons it believes are useful for defending itself and its free policy. The policy of the supreme commander is that our decision in Jordan must stem from the core of our country and the interest of our nation and great cause.

We went through special circumstances after the 1967 war. The United States stopped supplying us with arms for 2 years, because the officials in the U.S. administration "believed" that we attacked "Israel" and that we were the first to open fire. As a result of this "belief," the United States stopped supplying us with arms. We lagged behind 2 whole years in equipping our army. When we fought in Al-Karamah in 1968, we used weapons we had in storage, because we did not make up the arms lost in 1967. Now, we are obtaining arms from France, Britain and the United States. Some of these arms have arrived and others are on the way.

There is one basic point which every Jordanian citizen must understand: Namely, any weapon in the hand of the Jordanian soldier is a Jordanian weapon with which we fight in defense of Jordan and the Arabs. When weapons enter our territory, they become Jordanian Arab weapons, regardless of their place of manufacture. We in the armed forces are proud that we can integrate new weapons without the need to depend on foreign experts. If we are in need of an expert, we hire him for a period of not more than 6 months and then we use the weapon efficiently.

[Question] Has there been any new development with regard to Soviet weapons?

[Answer] No. The deal stands. We need weapons for defense against hostile aircraft. The weapons we bought are good and up-to-date. There has been no change in the agreement. It still stands.

[Question] It was said the Americans tried to make us cancel the Soviet deal in exchange for sophisticated U.S. weapons or the promise to supply us with such weapons.

[Answer] Actually, there has been no such agreement. We told them we were thinking of buying aircraft from them. We were sounding them out. They told us -- and I am referring here to Secretary Weinberger -- we will study every request you make with full sympathy.

I would like you to know that we do not buy weapons just because they would look good in a military parade in the streets of Amman. We buy the arms we need for defending our country. We do not go for showmanship.

[Question] Senator Edward Kennedy has launched a fierce campaign against the U.S. administration on the supply of sophisticated weapons to Jordan.

[Answer] This is an Israeli tactic to keep the issue alive in the press.

[Question] AP reported a few days ago that we requested a certain type of aircraft. It also gave a figure: 36, I believe.

[Answer] Actually, we have not so far made an official request for the purchase of any type of aircraft.

AR-RA'Y CALLS FOR ARAB NUCLEAR WEAPONS

JN261016 Amman Domestic Service in Arabic 0500 GMT 26 May 82

[From the press review]

[Text] Under the headline "The Arabs and the Israeli Nuclear Threat," AR-RA'Y says: It is not unusual for the Israeli mass media to carry information published in a book or newspaper about Israel's nuclear power because the aim is to exercise psychological warfare against the Arabs, to bring about despair and discouragement in their hearts and to make them imagine there is no hope in resisting Israeli aggression and there is nothing they can do but accept Israel's wishes. AR-RA'Y adds: It is true it would be unwise for the Arabs to ignore the possibility of the existence of nuclear weapons in Israel, but there is a great difference between taking this matter into consideration and using it as an incentive for the Arabs to speed up the building of their intrinsic power accordingly and considering it a discouraging factor in Arab efforts. There is no doubt the Arabs fully realize the difference between the two alternatives.

AR-RA'Y says: The implicit Israeli threat of nuclear weapons, whether those weapons exist or not in Israel, is a real reason for the Arabs to unhesitatingly knock on the door of nuclear weapons with any possible means to put an end to that threat. However, if there is any benefit from Israel's threat of its nuclear capabilities, this benefit is represented by urging the Arabs to build their intrinsic power to such a level that would enable them to achieve a strategic balance with the Israeli power and the capabilities it boasts of.

AR-RA'Y concludes: Despair and discouragement, the aims behind the Israeli psychological warfare, will not affect the Arabs, especially since they have been exposed to such a psychological war in the past. This soon disappeared when they were determined to work to face the challenge and put Israeli claims to the test.

FRENCH PREMIER MAUROY ARRIVES FOR 5-HOUR VISIT

NC261529 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The Lebanese military helicopter carrying French Premier Pierre Mauroy landed in the courtyard of the Republican Palace at 1615. Mauroy proceeded to the office of President of the Republic Ilyas Sarkis, who held a discussion with him, which was still in progress when this news report was being prepared.

NATIONAL NEWS AGENCY correspondent Darwish 'Ammar had reported earlier that the French premier arrived at the Beirut International Airport at 1602 aboard a special plane accompanied by the French military attache. The plane landed at the air base at Beirut International Airport.

Mauroy was met at the airport by [Tourism] Minister Marwan Hamadah, who represented the president of the republic; French Ambassador to Lebanon Paul Marc Henry; Brig Gen Yasin Suwayb, commander of the airport security organ; Ambassador Jean Riyashi, Foreign Ministry protocol director; and senior officials of the Lebanese Foreign Ministry and the French Embassy.

Stringent security measures were taken at the airport. Furthermore, and prior to the arrival of the French premier's plane, Lebanese Army helicopters flew around Beirut as a security precaution.

Premier Mauroy reviewed a guard of honor and did not make any statement. He then immediately boarded a Lebanese military helicopter and headed for the Republican Palace.

The director of Mauroy's office, (Robert Lyons), had earlier stated that the premier left Paris en route to Beirut on a visit meant to express France's desire to maintain its presence in Lebanon, despite the acts being launched against it.

Affirms Strong Ties

NC270905 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 0530 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] Speaking to newsmen yesterday, French Premier Pierre Mauroy said: In Beirut, Lebanon, and the Middle East France seeks only one goal -- peace. It works openly and without any other weapons save diplomacy and international law because France always follows the path of right and justice. For these reasons, France is a target of those who have made violence and terrorism their only weapon and of those following the methods and rules of war. He added: France will remain firm in facing these cowardly and ugly actions. It will not give in to blackmail attempts, threats or crimes. He added: France will not abandon its peaceful line which the friendly Lebanese authorities called on it to follow. France will continue to follow this course, patiently and tirelessly, and it will continue its efforts for the Lebanon's welfare and maintain its presence in this friendly country which is linked with France by strong ties.

Mauroy then asked the French ambassador to convey his feelings to the wounded and the condolences of the president of the French Republic and his own condolences to the victims' relatives. He said: The purpose of my visit to Beirut is to salute the souls of the victims of the French Embassy incident in the name of the French people and government. He hailed the memory of the late ambassador, Louis Delamare, and appreciated the current difficult conditions under which the diplomatic corps employees and all the French citizens working in all fields find themselves. I have come in my capacity as French premier to reaffirm our support and the solidarity of the French Government with them. The French premier added: My coming here is also an expression of France's solidarity with and support for Lebanon. I have expressed this to the president of the Lebanese Republic during my meeting with him.

Speaking about the ties existing between Lebanon and France and between the Lebanese and French peoples, Mauroy recalled the contribution of the French missionaries and cultural and educational missions which started coming to Lebanon in the 16th century. The French premier referred to the contribution of the Lebanese intellectuals who worked in the fields of education and literature in France and occupied high posts in the College de France. Mauroy recalled the 1860 French initiative when France stood alongside the Lebanese to preserve their identity and independence within the framework of the Ottoman Empire. He said: In 1864, six European states recognized Lebanon's self-rule as a result of the French initiative.

The French premier then related France's role in Lebanon's independence. Mauroy stressed France's support to the Lebanese formula saying: By achieving a detente among themselves, the Lebanese will guarantee Lebanon's continuation. Nobody other then Lebanese have the right to reconsider this formula. He added: France will continue to support Lebanon as long as the Lebanese authorities want this. My meetings have proved that the majority of the Lebanese, both Muslims and Christians, want to maintain the existing Lebanese formula.

Finally, Mauroy affirmed that in view of the Lebanese loyalty to their country, France will continue to defend Lebanon's freedom and independence, regardless of the difficulties. It will contribute to the search for a solution of this tragedy which has befallen Lebanon, which was once an example of civilized coexistence among religions. In conclusion, the French premier said: France has adopted precautionary measures against the acts of terrorism within the framework of the international diplomatic norms and laws. It urges all states to adopt similar measures against international terrorism.

Departs After Requiem

NC262246 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 2100 GMT 26 May 82

[Excerpt] French Premier Pierre Mauroy left Beirut a few minutes after 2100 tonight, concluding a visit of a few hours during which he met with President Sarkis and Prime Minister al-Wazzan and attended a requiem at As-Sunubar Palace given for the victims of the explosion at the French Embassy. Mauroy affirmed that France will stand by Lebanon as long as the Lebanese Government and people want it to do so. Mauroy added: France will remain firm in facing these criminal, cowardly actions. It will neither give in to blackmail through violence, nor will it change its stance because of threats or crimes or change the peaceful course which the Lebanese authorities called on it to follow. Thus, through perseverance, fortitude, and patience, France will continue to expend its efforts for the welfare of Lebanon and to maintain its presence in all forms in this friendly country to which we are linked by several ties.

Al-Wazzan Hails Visit

NC271025 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1000 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] Commenting on French Premier Pierre Mauroy's visit to Lebanon, Prime Minister al-Wazzan said: The visit has left the deepest impact in our hearts. It was a sincere expression of the friendship existing between our countries. It was proof of France's resolve to continue supporting this wounded homeland. At a time when some expected a negative stand by the French authorities as a result of the recurring attacks, the exact opposite has happened as is evidenced by this visit which came at the highest levels.

SARKIS ADDRESSES CABINET ON RECENT BOMBINGS

NC261338 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1300 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The Cabinet meeting ended at 1410 and the secretary general of the Prime Minister's Office, Dr 'Umar al-Missayki, released the following official statement: At the outset of the session, His Excellency President Sarkis briefed the Cabinet on the results of the visit by U.S. envoy Morris Draper to Beirut last weekend.

His excellency took time to mention the recent string of bombings, some of which were directed against the French Embassy in Beirut. He mentioned the toll of innocent victims, dead or wounded, in addition to the destruction and ruination wreaked by these explosions. His Excellency President Ilyas Sarkis urged the Lebanese to manifest greater consciousness and alertness in facing these evil acts, aimed at jeopardizing their steadfastness and their scrupulous adherence to the preservation of their freedom and their country's sovereignty.

The Cabinet then discussed the issues and projects placed on its agenda and approved a number of them. President Ilyas Sarkis today held extensive discussions with Prime Minister Shafiq al-Wazzan and Foreign and Expatriates Affairs Minister Fu'ad Butrus in light of the information received from the diplomatic missions abroad. Furthermore, a review was made of domestic political issues through an evaluation of opinions and viewpoints of Lebanese political and party leaderships, and particularly through the stances expected to be taken toward the subject of President Sarkis' trip [to the United Nations] to expound all the dimensions and causes of the Lebanese issue. A discussion also took place on the state of security measures following the bloody explosions in Beirut.

HADDAD SAYS PALESTINIANS VIOLATING CEASE-FIRE

NC270841 Marj 'Uyun Lebanon Voice of Hope in Arabic 0600 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] Free Lebanon Commander Maj Sa'd Haddad has stated that the swindlers [Palestinians] are overtly violating the cease-fire in southern Lebanon by planting mines in the area. He affirmed that the planting of mines is more dangerous than shelling because it is a cowardly act causing severe casualties.

During a meeting with Middle East affairs correspondents, Major Haddad added the swindlers are accumulating weapons in the occupied southern areas, the Soviet Union has an interest in heating up the situation and there is a possibility that the Soviet Union will instruct the organizations of George Habash and Nayif Hawatimah to violate the cease-fire. Major Haddad affirmed that the swindlers are systematically deporting the inhabitants of the areas under their control, as well as the areas under UNIFIL control, with the aim of emptying these areas of their inhabitants and turning them into bases for sabotage and training international terrorists.

Discussing the presidential elections to be held in August, Major Haddad said the era of legitimacy in Lebanon has ended and the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies, which renews its own term of office and which will elect the new president, is no longer legitimate. Major Haddad wondered what kind of legitimacy can emerge from illegitimacy.

Noting that President Ilyas Sarkis wants to go to New York shortly to address the UN General Assembly, Major Haddad said President Sarkis must only care about his homeland and must say he does not accept the presence of the Syrians and the swindlers in Lebanon. Major Haddad expressed regret because President Sarkis has not uttered such a statement so far.

ROMANIA'S CEAUSESCU CONCLUDES VISIT 26 MAY

Meets With Yasir 'Arafat

NC260721 (Clandestine) Voice of Palestine in Arabic 0530 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] PLO Executive Committee Chairman Brother Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat] met in Damascus last night with Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu, who is currently on an official visit to Syria.

Brother Abu 'Ammar and the Romanian president reviewed the situation in the Middle East in light of present developments and recurring Israeli threats to mount a wide-scale aggression against the Palestinian revolution and the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and also in light of the ferocious imperialist onslaught. The Romanian president reaffirmed his support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people under the PLO's leadership to attain their legitimate rights and establish their independent national state.

The two sides discussed ways of bolstering close relations between Romania and the PLO and ways of promoting cooperation in various fields.

Closed Meeting With Al-Asad

JN261242 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] President Hafiz al-Asad and President Nicolae Ceausescu resumed their talks in a closed meeting at the republican palace at 1030 today. President al-Asad hosted a luncheon in honor of President Ceausescu. It was attended by members of the two countries' delegations.

Departs Damascus

JN261700 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1615 GMT 26 May 82

[Excerpts] Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu left Damascus at 1515 today at the end of his brief visit to Syria. President Hafiz al-Asad led those who saw him off.

Upon the two presidents' arrival at Damascus International Airport, President Ceausescu shook hands with members of the Ba'th Party National and Regional Commands, ministers and heads of the diplomatic missions who were there to see him off.

President Ceausescu shook hands with President Hafiz al-Asad; Comrade 'Abdallah al-Ahmar, assistant secretary general of the Arab Socialist Ba'th Party; Dr 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm, prime minister; Faruq ash-Shar', minister of state for foreign affairs; the Syrian ambassador in Bucharest; and the Romanian ambassador in Damascus.

USSR'S IVAN ARKHIPOV CONTINUES VISIT TO DAMASCUS

Meets With Khaddam

JN261205 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1115 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, met with Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at 1000 today. Vladimir Yukhin, Soviet ambassador in Damascus, attended the meeting. The discussions dealt with relations between the two friendly countries and the current international situation.

Meets With Prime Minister

JN261302 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1215 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Prime Minister 'Abd ar-Ra'uf al-Kasm received Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at 1200 today. The meeting was attended by 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, and Vladimir Yukhin, Soviet ambassador in Damascus.

The discussion during this meeting dealt with relations of friendship and cooperation between the two friendly countries and the profound and solid development achieved by these relations in all fields. Both Al-Kasm and Arkhipov expressed their great satisfaction with the existing strong cooperation between the two friendly countries.

The discussion also dealt with various matters relating to prevailing circumstances in the region, the explosive situation and the latest developments, which call upon all forces fighting for a just peace to firmly confront the continuous aggressive and conspiratorial plans of international imperialism and Zionism.

Meets With Al-Asad

JN262110 Damascus Domestic Service in Arabic 1915 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] President Hafiz al-Asad received Ivan Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers at 1830 today. The meeting was attended by 'Abd al-Halim Khaddam, deputy prime minister and foreign minister, and Vladimir Yukhin, Soviet ambassador in Damascus.

Arkhipov conveyed to President Hafiz al-Asad the greetings of President Brezhnev and the Soviet leadership. The president thanked him and asked him to convey to President Brezhnev and the Soviet leaders his greetings and good wishes and to convey to them Syria's great appreciation for the USSR's stands in support of our just struggle.

The talks dealt with the strong ties of friendship and cooperation between Syria and the USSR and the results of the talks Arkhipov held in Damascus. The president and Arkhipov expressed satisfaction with these successful results. The talks also dealt with the common struggle factors between the two countries and the different aspects of the situation in the Middle East. The two sides stressed the strong Syrian-Soviet relations. The president stressed, in this respect, the failure of all attempts to undermine these relations. He also stressed Syria's steadfastness in face of all imperialist pressures and its optimism about the future.

VOL REPORTS CLASHES, EXPLOSIONS IN ALEPPO

NC261827 Beirut Voice of Lebanon in Arabic 1715 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] According to reports sent to the Voice of Lebanon, a number of Muslim Brotherhood members were arrested at noon yesterday in (As-Sabil) locality, Aleppo. Members of the Muslim Brotherhood fired at an army patrol in (Al-Manshiyah) locality, killing one and injuring another. The area was then surrounded, and a number of suspects were arrested.

At 0400 [0200 GMT] today, four explusions were heard in (Al-Mukbu) locality. Moreover, four young men were found dead on the plains of Aleppo. Checkpoints were set up in the northern sector of the city, especially on Dayr az-Zur Road, where quantities of weapons and ammunition were found on some persons and confiscated.

MINISTER SHARON WARNS OF MIDDLE EAST ARMS RACE

TA261818 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1700 GMT 26 May 82

[From the "Evening Newsreel"]

[Text] Defense Minister Ari'el Sharon, who is now in Washington, has described the supply of weapons from the United States to Jordan as one of the three gravest dangers to Israel. He says the balance of forces between Israel and the Arab countries, which in the past was 3 to 1 against Israel, will be 5 to 1 against Israel by the end of the decade. In a talk with our Washington correspondent Shalom Qital, Minister Sharon said:

[Begin Sharon recording] Israel knowingly stopped its arms race because of the heavy burden, the financial burden, because of the need to invest large sums of money in education, in health, in settlements, in science, in research, and all sorts of other things, in infrastructure. Everything needed to be built to maintain a country. Because we have stopped the arms race, the arms race by the other side is advancing at full speed with, in fact, both blocs competing to arm the Arab countries. Today we regard any addition of modern, sophisticated weapons, and, to our regret, old weapons are not being produced in the world. [sentence as heard] Only newer weapons are being produced, more modern, more sophisticated. Any supply of such weapons to Arab countries puts us in a difficult situation and, in fact, is a great danger to peace. I have expressed this concern to the United States in my talks. We are concerned about the supply of sophisticated weapons to any Arab country, but especially when it is a country like Jordan. We regard this very gravely. [end recording]

REACTION TO SHARON REMARKS ON ARMS TO IRAN

Alignment MK Demands Recall

TA262009 Jerusalem Domestic Television Service in Hebrew 1900 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Israel has supplied Iran with a small quantity of arms and ammunition because it regards Iraq, Iran's foe, as being dangerous to the peace process in the Middle East, said Defense Minister Ari'el Sharon today in an interview with the U.S. NBC-TV network. Sharon added that Israel does not support Iran's war efforts and emphasized that Israel's arms supplies involved small quantities only.

MK Mikha'el Bar-Zohar of the Alignment sent a message today to Prime Minister Menahem Begin demanding that Defense Minister Ari'el Sharon be recalled from the United States at once so that an inquiry can be held on his disclosing in a public interview that Israel has sold arms to Iran. MK Bar-Zohar also submitted an urgent motion to the Knesset agenda on this, stating that Israel's arms deals are top secret, and anyone who reveals such a security secret is seriously transgressing the law.

Reacting to MK Bar-Zohar's message, Prime Minister Menahem Begin said the following tonight: It is your message that shows irresponsibility. The defense minister is carrying out a national [mamlakhtit ule'umit] mission with great success. Those are the prime minister's remarks.

Cabinet To Discuss

TA270923 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0900 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] Several ministers will raise at the Cabinet meeting the matter of Defense Minister Sharon's remarks on the Israeli arms supply to Iran. This has been learned by our correspondent Razi Barqay.

Our correspondent says these ministers express their surprise at Sharon's declarations. It was further learned that it was not known in Jerusalem in advance that Sharon intended to disclose this matter and that the prime minister's expression of support for Sharon was given postfactum.

PAPERS CRITICIZE GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR IRAN

TA270629 Jerusalem Domestic Service in English 0500 GMT 27 May 82

[Review of morning press editorials]

[Text] Labor's DAVAR writes about the Iran-Iraq war. The paper believes Israel's judgment needs some changing. It is true that a regime that hates Israel more than Baghdad's Saddam Husayn is hard to imagine but it is possible the consequences of his overthrow would not be to Israel's advantage. This does not mean a flare-up on the eastern front directed by Syria and backed by Iran, but rather instability in the Persian Gulf that might bring in the superpowers. Soviet-U.S. cooperation to control troublemakers like Khomeyni might become a habit and might one day apply to the Israel-Arab conflict, warns DAVAR.

MAPAM's 'AL HAMISHMAR comments that if the U.S. claims are correct, one can wonder about the long-term Israeli strategic planning that dictates support for the Iran of Khomeyni in its war against Iraq. It is true that Iraq is no friend of Israel but it is in Israel's interest to stay completely neutral in this. It is clear, writes 'AL HAMISHMAR, that Israeli and U.S. long-term strategies in this regard are far apart.

SHAMIR CRITICIZES U.S. ARMS SALES TO JORDAN

TA261133 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1112 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The Knesset this morning took a break from its political activity for a few hours and heard harsh remarks by Foreign Minister Shamir on the dangers to Israel if sophisticated U.S. arms are supplied to Jordan. Our correspondent Razi Barqay reports from the Knesset.

[Begin recording] [Barqay] The Alignment and the Likud today united around this issue and remarks made by the foreign minister in the Knesset.

[Shamir] It is not but that the United States does not properly evaluate the seriousness of our warnings and the gravity of the danger we see in the funneling of these destructive tools to Jordan's arms depot. The supply of modern missiles and aircraft to Jordan is a continuation of the political policy of supplying sophisticated AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia, but in this case the danger is more concrete, nearer and graver due to Jordan's nearness to our cities and villages. We are asking ourselves whether the U.S. officials that decide arms sales policy are aware of the significance of their decisions and steps.

[Barqay] Only the HADASH faction wanted to express opposition at the end of the debate. You are all being selective in criticism of arms supplies, MK Tawiq Tubi told the Knesset members. However, as mentioned, the Knesset decided almost unanimously to hold a debate on the matter of the flow of sophisticated U.S. arms to Jordan. [end recording]

Warns of Consequences

TA261211 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1115 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] This morning the Knesset almost completely united in criticism of U.S. arms supplies to Jordan. Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir said in the debate that the supply of arms to Jordan will free it from one of the restraints which in the past caused it to refrain from war-like actions.

[Begin Shamir recording] Israel will not be able to put up with these moves and cannot afford to wait until the accumulated aggressive power of Jordan will be ripe for an attack on Israel's centers of population. It is difficult not to see the worrisome contradictions in the policy of our friend, the United States, who, on the one hand has and is investing a great deal in the Camp David peace progress, and on the other is sending to the region huge quantities of dangerous arms which may result in violence, a poisoning of the atmosphere and destroy the peace. [end recording]

Further Remarks

JN261805 Jerusalem in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Foreign Minister Shamir today spoke in the Knesset on Israel's position with regard to the supply of U.S. arms to Jordan. Our political correspondent Yitzhaq Halevi has just returned from the Knesset building. Yitzhaq, good evening.

[Halevi] Good evening. In reply to a motion by three Knesset members, Shamir said that 3 months ago, the Knesset debated the subject of the sale of sophisticated U.S. weapons to Jordan. At the conclusion of its debate, and with the aporoval of all the Knesset factions, the Knesset adopted a resolution which read: The supply of sophisticated weapons to an eastern front state, which refuses to enter into peace negotiations with Israel constitutes a serious threat to Israel's security. The Knesset calls on the United States, in light of statements by the U.S. President and Congressional decisions, to stop jeopardizing Israel's security.

Shamir said: We hear these days from leading figures in the U.S. administration that the United States insists on supplying Jordan with sophisticated and devastating weapons. Mobile surface-to-air missiles will give the Jordanian Army, in the field of air defense, a defense capability. It will be able to defend attacking forces, or forces participating in offensive operations. The supply of sophisticated mobile surface-to-air missiles to the Jordanian Army will free this army of restrictions, which prevented it in the past from joining war operations, because, the Hawk missiles which will be deployed near our border will be fired in the direction of our planes, when they fly from airfields inside Israel.

The foreign minister spoke about the modern and sophisticated planes which the United States intends to supply to Jordan. He said: This move will give the Jordanian Air Force a great offensive capability. It will also increase the threat to Israeli security.

The minister said: The supply of mobile missiles and modern aircraft to Jordan is an extension of the political line to supply Saudi Arabia with AWACS aircraft. But the danger of supplying Jordan with such weapons will be more tangible, because of Jordan's proximity to our towns and villages.

Shamir refuted claims that Jordan is a moderate, stable and peaceful pro-Western state, which must be supplied with arms so it can defend itself. He said: There is not the slightest truth in this. Jordan attacked Israel in 1948 without any provocation. It also attacked Israel during the 6-day war. Furthermore, Jordan joined the group which opposed peace following the signing of the Camp David accords. It formed a single front with the rejection front states and the terrorist organizations. Jordan's representatives throughout the world and in international organisations have opposed and are opposing and relentlessly working against peace.

Shamir added: The joint committee formed by Jordan and the terrorist organizations is working ceaselessly to poison the atmosphere and to destroy any prospect for reconciliation [sulh] or peace in Eretz Yisra'el.

There is no doubt that the weapons obtained by Jordan will not be used, even once, in a war against the enemies of the Western states or against the USSR and its satellites, but will be used solely in a war against Israel.

Shamir then dealt with the flow of sophisticated arms into the Middle East. He said: The arms depots are filled to the brim, they constitute a threat to world peace. Therefore, this region does not need more weapons, but peace, stability and calm.

The foreign minister concluded by saying: Israel cannot accept such moves. Furthermore, it cannot wait until Jordan's offensive strength is ready to pounce on our towns and their inhabitants. We appeal to the U.S. Government and people once again to stop playing with fire and cancel all programs or intentions to supply Jordan with sophisticated and devastating weapons, which will threaten Israeli security and world peace.

The Knesset decided to discuss the subject of the U.S. supply of modern and sophisticated weapons to Jordan at a future session.

OFFICIALS REACT TO CHARGE OF ARMS TO ARGENTINA

Begin Adviser Denial

TA261113 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The prime minister's communications adviser, Uri Porat, said today the Ecuadorean plane that stopped [in New York] today was not carrying arms to Argentina. In response to a question by our political correspondent Shim'on Schiffer, Mr Porat refused to disclose where these arms are destined, saying Israel is not in the habit of reporting its arms deals.

Foreign Ministry Denial

TA261353 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1200 GMT 26 May 82

[Report by Alan Ben-'Ami -- recorded]

[Excerpt] This morning, after news of the Ecuadorean plane incident was reported, the Israeli Foreign Ministry contacted British Ambassador to Israel Patrick Moberley to assure him there was no truth in any report that Israel was shipping arms to Argentina. British Embassy officials said the Israeli assurances would be forwarded to London. Earlier this month, the British made a much-publicized request to Israel not to supply arms to Argentina and received Israeli assurances that Israel had no intention of shipping arms to Argentina or signing new contracts with Argentina.

Ecuadorean officials confirm that the cargo jet detained at Kennedy airport does have spare parts for aircraft. They also say all the plane's cargo is intended for us by the Ecuadorean Government. They point out the cargo plane has made at least one stop, in Ireland, on its flight to Quito. Whether or not the plane is carrying military arms or where they may have been loaded remains unanswered.

Israeli officials, as a matter of policy, do not comment on any reports concerning possible Israeli arms deals or shipments, but they do confirm that Israel has a contract to service Ecuadorean planes here.

Adviser Reiterates Denial

TA262042 Jerusalem Domestic Television Service in Hebrew 1900 GMT 26 May 82

[Excerpt] The prime minister's adviser for communications and foreign press affairs, Uri Porat, said today that the aircraft detained today in New York is not carrying Israeli arms to Argentina.

Replying to a quesiton by our political correspondent Elimelekh Ram, Mr Porat refused to disclose for whom the Israeli military hardware in the aircraft is intended and merely said Israel is not in the habit of reporting on arms deals with foreign countries. Nonetheless, he emphasized there is no connection between the cargo on that aircraft and Argentina.

Political sources in Jerusalem have told our correspondent the military equipment loaded on the aircraft is intended for a South American country, but declined to disclose which one.

As for the aid Israel has been extending to Iran, the adviser repeated the statement that Israel reports neither on prucurement sources nor on arms sales. He refused to comment on whether or not Israel had extended military aid to Iran in its war against Iraq. This statement by the adviser was made to our correspondent a few hours before Defense Minister Sharon disclosed in Washington that Israel had supplied Iran with arms.

SWISS DEFENSE MINISTRY DENIES ARMS DEAL

TA261821 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1700 GMT 26 May

[From the "Evening Newsreel"]

[Text] Switzerland has denied remarks by Prime Minister Menahem Begin that it signed a $200 million agreement with Israel not long ago to buy antitank missiles and to refurbish tanks in its army's possession. A spokesman for the Swiss Defense Ministry has said the report is completely unfounded. It is true Switzerland is examining Israel's plan to refurbish the old Centurion tanks in its possession, but he emphasized this is just one of the proposals being examined.

Another spokesman for the Swiss Defense Ministry has said that, in accordance with an agreement signed last year, Switzerland is purchasing shells from Israel, but this is the only arms deal between the two countries.

INVOLVEMENT DENIED IN BEIRUT EMBASSY BOMBING

TA261238 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1200 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Israel's embassy in Paris has totally rejected charges that Israel was involved in the terrorist act perpetrated against the French Embassy in Beirut. It was stated in an official announcement released by the embassy that such an accusation was meant to sabotage relations between Israel and France. Israel, it was emphasized, is shocked by the abhorrent terrorist act, extends its condolences to the families and hopes the people responsible for this will be caught and brought to trial.

HADDAD: 'TERRORISTS' CONTINUE TO INFILTRATE

TA270930 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 27 May 82 p 1

[Report by Arab affairs correspondent 'Oded Zarayy]

[Text] The PLO has turned southern Lebanon into a major training base and staging area for acts of murder, terrorism and sabotage, not only against the peaceful Lebanese residents in the border section of "Free Lebanon" and Israel but also against various targets throughout the world. They work in cooperation with international terrorist organizations. This was said yesterday by the commander of "the Lebanese Forces," Maj Sa'd Haddad, during a tour with the Israeli Arab affairs correspondents in southern Lebanon. Haddad and the commander of the western sector, (Abu Amil), disclosed that the terrorists are continuing to speedily set up fortifications and positions in areas under UNIFIL control as well.

IN these areas the terrorists systematically compel Lebanese villagers, through acts of robbery and murder, to abandon their villages. These villages are turned into PLO training bases and fortified positions without UNIFIL interference.

In recent weeks, tens of Shi'ite Muslim families have fled emptyhanded from their villages — 'Abbasiyah, (Saqsiyah), Dayr Yuhunna, 'Adlun and others -- toward "Free Lebanon" to ask for asylum. For instance, Haddad noted that only 3 days ago a family from Majdal Silm which is under UNIFIL control came to him emptyhanded after terrorists had murdered two of its children.

The Lebanese commanders in southern Lebanon do not exclude the possibility that the terrorists, with Syrian-Soviet encouragement, will intensify the terrorist attempts from southern Lebanon.

According to Haddad, information on events in southern Lebanon is incorrect. Haddad says the world does not know that the terrorists are in fact incessantly continuing their attempts to infiltrate into the sectors he controls and perpetrate terrorist and mining acts which are graver than shellings. Since the cease-fire took effect the terrorists have perpetrated about 42 such acts.

The Beirut papers yesterday gave front page coverage to the report on the downing of the two Syrian MiG's by the Israeli Air Force in southern Lebanon the day before yesterday. They also printed the pictures of the two wounded Syrian pilots and the wreckage of one of the planes.

NORTHERN BORDER REPORTED QUIET FOLLOWING CLASH

TA261159 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] IDF patrol flights in Lebanon continued this morning as well. UNIFIL officers emphasized the incident in which the Syrian aircraft were shot down yesterday did not give rise to tension in the region and that all sectors in southern Lebanon are totally quiet. Our correspondent in the north Hayim Hecht reports:

[Begin recording] UNIFIL's observation posts in southern Lebanon have not reported any unusual activity following yesterday's incident in which two Syrian planes were downed. The UNIFIL observers' reports speak of IDF flights yesterday and today, but these are absolutely routine events, the UNIFIL spokesman stresses.

UNIFIL officers reported that yesterday, when the IDF planes flew low over Sidon, antiaircraft fire was opened at them from terrorist positions. Reports on the IDF patrol flights appear in the daily report we are sending to the UN secretary general in New York, I was told by a senior UNIFIL officer this morning. He wanted to emphasize, however, that an analysis of the meaning of these flights is a matter for politicians and not for the UN observers.

As may be recalled, the chief of staff stated yesterday that the flights over Lebanon are a legitimate need of the State of Israel. The objective of the flights is one of intelligence and deterrence, Lt Gen Refa'el Eytan said, and they will continue. It is emphasized in the IDF that the Pentagon does not view the patrol flights over Lebanon as a breach of the cease-fire.

The vanguard unit of the French reinforcement force arrived at UNIFIL's command in An-Nuqurah this morning. The force will consist of 635 soldiers who will be deployed along the Litani River, in the At-Tayyibah region. Nigerian UNIFIL soldiers are now located in this sector. [end recording]

'BORED' MERCENARIES REPORTED LEAVING LEBANON

TA261232 Tel Aviv YOMAN HASHAVU'A in Hebrew 26 May 82 p 6

[Report by 'Imanu'el Duday]

[Text] Some of the "volunteer" mercenaries in the service of Maj Sa'd Haddad have recently left southern Lebanon. Several British and Canadian citizens who arrived in the area at the end of 1981 are involved. A source in southern Lebanon reported the mercenaries said they were "bored." When they enlisted they were promised action, but because the sector has been quiet for almost a year now and because Haddad is engaging them as drivers for armored troop vehicles and as communications systems operators they decided to leave.

The Lebanese source claimed that despite Haddad's statement the "volunteers" are receiving wages of $100 a month they are actually receiving $400 a month. The source also claimed that even their families in the United States, Canada and Britian were almost certainly receiving considerable sums. According to the source there are presently 40 mercenaries in the area.

The source of the financing for the mercenaries is unclear. One of the "volunteers," 29-year-old (Joe Kisor) of Evanston, Illinois, said he had been enlisted by way of propaganda broadcast for Haddad on a Christian television station in Texas. The broadcast had been prepared by members of the Otis' adventure mission, who operate Christian broadcasting stations in southern Lebanon and who also help Haddad by other means.

ANTIVEHICLE MINE EXPLODES; TRUCK DAMAGED

TA270806 Tel Aviv ITIM in Hebrew 0755 GMT 27 May 82

[Excerpt] Beersheba, 27 May -- A Mack fuel truck hit an antivehicle mine on a dirt road near Beersheba. As a result of the explosion the truck was damaged, but the driver was not hurt.

Police believe this is a terrorist act. Therefore, all dirt roads near Beersheba were checked following the incident. Police have requested that people refrain from driving on dirt roads if possible.

ARABS SENTENCED FOR THROWING MOLOTOV COCKTAILS

TA261823 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1800 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The Ramallah military court has sentenced five youths from the Bethlehem area to prison for having thrown Molotov cocktails at a military car. Our correspondent Arye Gus reports the squad members also tried to attack a military guardpost near Bayt Sahur, but the attempt failed. They have been sentenced to prison for terms ranging from 3 years and 6 months to 4 years.

EYTAN SAYS EGYPT COOPERATING AGAINST TERRORISM

TA261730 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1600 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Israel and Egypt have recently been cooperating in everything pertaining to foiling terrorist attempts to introduce arms from Egypt into the Gaza District through northern Sinai. This was stated today by the chief of staff.

Our military correspondent Shmu'el Tal reports that Lieutenant General Eytan today toured the new border with Egypt, from Tabah to Rafah. He was accompanied by his deputy, the commander of the Southern Command and the police inspector general.

In Rafah, Eytan heard a report from the commander of the region on the problems involved in the partitioning of the city and toured the border all the way to the sea. It has been reported that the negotiations with those inhabitants of Rafah whose houses will have to be demolished will end in a week.

Our correspondent has learned that the compensation the inhabitants will receive will probably amount to more than 200,000 shekels per family. Persons evacuated from a refugee camp will receive land as well as 40,000 shekels per family.

TABAH TALKS WITH EGYPT END IN DISAGREEMENT

TA262028 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] In the talks on Tabah held in Beersheba today by the joint Israeli-Egyptian Military Committee, no agreement could be reached. The Egyptians repeated their demand that the Sinai Multinational Force and Observers [MFO] stationed at Tabah be given great authority. Israel maintains that the MFO should only be responsible for security in the area. It was decided to continue the talks in the next few days.

MAPAM WILL NOT 'BREAK UP' ALIGNMENT COALITION

TA261949 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1900 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] MAPAM will not break up the Alignment because of the incorporation of Knesset Members Amnon Linn and Yitzhaq Peretz into the Alignment. At the end of a discussion today that lasted about 5 hours, the MAPAM Secretariat decided that it was prepared to maintain any form of parliamentary partnership if it hastens the downfall of the Likud government. MAPAM has said that if the Labor Party insists on the maintenance of the political and organizational agreement with Knesset Members Peretz and Linn, it will itself be held responsible for breaking the partnership between the two parties.

MAPAM's senior member, Ya'aqov Hazan, said during the discussion that this had been one of the most difficult periods for the future of the Labor movement in Israel and the future of the partnership with the Labor Party. In his opinion, the Labor Party made a grave mistake when it brought in the two Knesset members. At the same time, in Hazan's opinion, the establishing of the two Knesset members as a separate faction could lead to a solution of the problem.

BEGIN DESIRES ACTION TO PROTEST GREECE-PLO TIES

TA261246 Tel Aviv YOMAN HASHAVU'A in Hebrew 26 May 82 p 7

[Text] Prime Minister Menahem Begin thinks Israel should take political steps against Greece in reaction to its support for the PLO and its open ties with the Palestinian terrorist organization.

The prime minister thinks Israel cannot reconcile itself to the continuation of these ties and that it must reexamine its relations with Greece.

Begin's proposal to this effect surprised political observers, who believe Israel should cultivate every possible political tie with states it can. Political observers contend that Greece is not the only state to recognize the PLO and that Israel would be making a mistake if it initiated a political crisis with Athens.

EBAN, FRANCE'S CHEYSSON HOLD POLITICAL TALKS

TA262029 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 2000 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] France's external relations minister has expressed satisfaction with the shift in Israeli-African relations. He also expressed satisfaction over the fact that since President Mitterrand visited Israel, other European figures have visited it. Speaking to MK Abba Eban in Paris, Cheysson said international cooperation is necessary to combat terrorism. MK Eban expressed regret at the incident that occurred 2 days ago at the French Embassy in Beirut. Cheysson and Eban agreed the autonomy talks have reached an impasse and that chances of thawing the freeze are not great.

Labor Party Chairman Peres will meet with French President Francois Mitterrand on Friday.

EHRLICH ENDS UNITED KINGDOM VISIT, COMMENTS

TA261341 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1100 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Deputy Prime Minister and Agriculture Minister Simha Ehrlich ended an official visit to Britain today. The visit lasted 2 days, and the minister held working meetings with the British minister of agriculture. The minister told our correspondent in Britain Shim'on Tessler that he was heartily received despite disagreements with Britain concerning reports that Israel is supplying arms to Argentina.

[Begin Ehrlich recording] In contrast to the past -- as also stated by our ambassador here -- this time I was received in the best possible manner; in a way in which a foreign minister who comes for an official 2-day visit is received. The schedule of the visit was full; the atmosphere was cordial. I would simply say that I felt a friendship and a sincere warmth and good will in meeting us halfway with regard to all the requests and proposals we brought with us. [end recording]

Ehrlich hinged the success of the visit on the preparations made by former British Foreign Secretary Lord Carrington.

BURG RETURNS FROM INTERNATIONAL TOUR, COMMENTS

TA261956 Tel Aviv in Hebrew 1850 GMT 26 May 82

[Excerpt] Ben-Gurion Airport, 26 May -- Interior Minister Yosef Burg said this evening there is a big difference between deciding on holding early elections and removing the police department from the Interior Ministry.

Dr Burg was answering reporters' questions at Ben-Gurion Airport on his return from Vienna on an El Al plane after a 2-week tour of the United States, Canada and South Africa. On his way home he stopped for a few days in Switzerland.

We never disqualified anybody and we betray no one, said Dr Burg in answer to a question on whether the NRP will consider joining a coalition headed by the Alignment. We have always favored a national unity government, he said.

ITALIAN PRIME MINISTER TO MAKE OFFICIAL VISIT

TA261701 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 1600 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Italian Prime Minister Giovanni Spadolini will make an official visit to Israel. This has been reported officially in Rome. He has accepted an invitation extended by Prime Minister Menahem Begin. No date has yet been set for this visit.

POLICE REINFORCEMENT ON GOLAN HEIGHTS EXPLAINED

TA260931 Jerusalem Domestic Service in Hebrew 0505 GMT 26 May 82

[Report by Yo'el Dar -- recorded]

[Text] [Dar] So far it has been possible to sweep the disagreements among the Golan Heights residents under the rug. The Golan Heights laborers accepted the ruling of their leaders and remained at home while the leaders, the clergy and the pro-Syrian Druze continued to till their fields and plantations uninterrupted. The workers did not express any protest as long as it was promised that 25 percent of the total income of the apple crop would be given to them as compensation. However, public reservations can now be heard. A group of workers whose number is not known has announced its intention to resume regular work. However, when the strike organizers learned of this they hurriedly decided to require that no resident leave his village without prior permission from them. The workers, in contrast, stated they are determined to leave for work whatever the consequences.

I asked the deputy commander of the northern police district, Levi Sha'ul, whether the police will defend those who want to resume their normal routine.

[Sha'ul] It was against this background that a force has been concentrated in the Golan and several measures have been adopted to prevent any instance of workers' being barred from leaving for their jobs.

[Dar] Last night the head of the Druze-Zionist circle and several of the pro-Israeli Golan Druze were attacked. The head of the circle, Salman Abu Salah, said this morning that a group of residents last night attacked his house in the village of Majdal Shams and stoned him and the pro-Israeli Druze staying with him. The attackers shouted: If we do not kill you it is the Syrians who will do so in due course when they return here. The police were summoned to the place. The reason for the new eruption against the pro-Israeli Golan Druze is not clear yet. This eruption comes after a relatively quiet period of about 3 weeks.

POST POLL SHOWS SMALLER PARTIES LOSING SUPPORT

TA270837 Jerusalem POST in English 27 May 82 pp 1, 2

[Report by Mark Segal]

[Text] There is now only a five-seat gap between Likud and Labour, as the Yamit trauma has apparently halved the Likud's April lead. However, the two big parties continue to gain ground, accounting for 81 percent of the vote, with only Tehiya among the small parties holding its own.

The May Jerusalem POST poll was conducted by the Modi'in Ezrahi Research Institute among a representative sample of 1,233 adults between 2 May and 14 May.

Institute Director Dr Sara Shemer pointed to the constant stream of votes from the smaller parties to the two main blocs, with Telem disappearing off the electoral map, and the three religious parties losing a mandate each.

Q. "For which party would you vote if elections were held now?"

	May 1982 MK's	April 1982 MK's	June 1981 MK's
Likud	51	54	48
Labour Alignment	46	44	47
NRP	5	5	6
Agudat Yisra'el bloc	4	5	4
TAMI	2	2	3
Tehiya	4	4	3
Shinui	2	2	2
CRM	1	1	1
Telem	-	-	1
RAKAH and others	5	4	4

Further analysis of the data indicated that Labour has held on tc the sympathies of 80 percent of those who voted for it last June, while the Likud has held on to 72 percent of its voters.

Shemer related that, when it came to voting preferences according to sexes, 37 percent of the men opted for the Likud compared to 26 percent for Labour, with 27 percent of women voting Likud and 30 percent for Labour.

A poll conducted by the PORI Institute, published in HA'ARETZ on 26 May, showed that the Likud has the image among a majority of the public of a strong, new party whereas the Alignment is seen as old and weak.

PORI POLLS PUBLIC ON LIKUD, ALIGNMENT IMAGES

TA261504 Tel Aviv HA'ARETZ in Hebrew 26 May 82 p 3

[PORI public opinion poll: "The Public's Image of the Two Parties: Alignment -- Weak and Old-Fashioned; Likud -- Strong and Modern"]

[Text] In the eyes of the public, the Labor Party is seen more as a "weak," "old," and "old-fashioned" party that "does not evoke confidence," while the Likud is regarded as a "strong," "young" and "modern" party that "evokes confidence." These are some of the marks that the public gave to the two large parties in a nationwide public opinion poll conducted by PORI for HA'ARETZ.

An examination of the two parties' public image shows that the Labor Party is regarded more as "dovish," "Ashkenazi," "socialist" and "leftist," while the Likud is seen more as "hawkish," "Sephardic," "capitalist" and "rightist."

Opinion is split on the Alignment functioning as the opposition. About half of the public think the Alignment functions well as the opposition, while about half did not think so. Both the Likud and Labor Party were described as "honest" parties that are not corrupt.

The percentage of those who believe the Alignment is presently not suited to return to power was twice that of those who believe the opposite -- 54.1 percent as compared with 26.9 percent -- and 7.8 percent said the Alignment's return to power depends on "who heads it."

To the question, "Who in your opinion should head the Labor Party?" most of those polled answered Yitzhaq Rabin; 45.2 percent of the public said they would like to see Rabin as the leader of the Alignment; 16.6 percent answered Shim'on Peres; 5.8 percent said they would like to see President Yitzhaq Navon as the leader of the Alignment; and 29.3 percent did not cite anyone's name. No other figure received 1 percent or more. However, among those who figured in less than 1 percent of the responses were Mordekhay Gur, Hayim Bar-Lev, Abba Eban, Hayim Tzadoq, Hayim Herzog, Ya'aqov Levinson and Yosef Teqo'a.

Even among Alignment voters Yitzhaq Rabin was heavily favored over Shim'on Peres: 46.2 percent as compared with 26.9 percent, with 9.5 percent answering they would like to see Yitzhaq Navon at the head of their party and 15.1 percent not citing anyone.

About half the public — 49.9 percent — thinks that an Alignment government would not cope more successfully with the problems facing the Likud government, while 26.7 percent held that it would. About 15 percent believes that no party would succeed in dealing with the country's problems.

The solution supported by most of the public for dealing with the country's problems is the establishment of a national unity government combining the Alignment and the Likud — 62.7 percent of those polled favor setting up a national unity government compared with 27 percent who were opposed.

Support for establishing a national unity government was greater among Likud voters than among Alignment voters — 71 percent compared with 51.2 percent. However, among Alignment voters the percentage of those favoring a national unity government exceeded the percentage of those opposed — 51.2 percent compared with 39.3 percent.

The poll was based on a representative nationwide sample of 1,200 men and women who were personally interviewed in their homes.

BRIEFS

VENEZUELAN HEALTH MINISTER -- Jerusalem, 23 May -- A meeting was held today between Israeli Minister of Health Eli'ezer Shostak and Venezuelan Health Minister Jose Luis Gonzales, who arrived in Israel on 22 May. The Venezuelan health minister invited Shostak to visit his country. Dr Gonzales will spend 1 week in Israel and attend Israeli medicine week activities. He will mainly visit medical industry plants. [Tel Aviv ITIM in Hebrew 1800 GMT 23 May 82 TA]

AR-RAYAH REPORTS ETHIOPIA-SUDAN BORDER ACTIVITY

GF241804 Doha AR-RAYAH in Arabic 24 May 82 pp 1, 11

["Exclusive" dispatch from Cairo]

[Excerpt] AR-RAYAH has learned from Egyptian and Sudanese sources in Cairo that since last week the Sudanese-Ethiopian border, which extends more than 1,500 kilometers, has been the site of mutual massing of troops. It has also been learned that the situation has deteriorated so quickly that it threatens widescale military conflict. Furthermore, the political and military leaderships in Egypt and the Sudan, caired by Presidents Mubarak and Numayri, will hold an important meeting during the next hours to discuss the grave situation.

During the past few days, there have been top-level military consultations between Egypt and the Sudan. These consultations reached a climax recently during the visit of Egyptian Defense Minister Field Marshal 'Abd al-Halim Abu Ghazalah. Sudanese military officials have also arrived in Cairo to exchange information and to consult with their Egyptian comrades.

AR-RAYAH has also learned that Cairo and Khartoum began a few days ago immediate implementation of measures to execute the agreement of joint defense and military integration between the two countries. According to a Sudanese source in Cairo, these measures include exchange of information, plans for military action, training and joint maneuvers in the Sudanese and Egyptian territories, in addition to the possibility of transferring combat troops with all their military euqipment from one country to the other.

AR-RAYAH has also learned that last week, military experts from the two countries inspected the eastern regions of the Sudanese border and the regions where Ethiopian troops are concentrated. They also prepared a report evaluating the situation and submitted a memorandum to the Sudanese-Egyptian political leadership.

AR-RAYAH has also learned that the Ethiopian troops strengthened their positions along the Sudanese eastern front through the deployment of huge forces and sophisticated equipment, including tanks, missiles and Soviet-made artillery. Ethiopian warplanes were also observed along the border in violation of the Sudanese airspace at many points, but they returned quickly to their bases.

AR-RAYAN has also learned that Sudanese President Ja'far Numayri sent urgent messages to a number of Arab and friendly leaders explaining the grave situation. His message to Saudi King Khalid was one of the most important messages, due to the strategic and security association between Sudan and the Arabian Peninsula through the Red Sea.

Observers in Cairo note that there could be many reasons for this sudden massing of Ethiopian troops, including drawing Egypt and Sudan into a military clash along the long and bumpy Ethiopian-Sudanese border in order to achieve the attrition of their capabilities, divert their attention from the Iraqi-Iranian war and stop the effective Egyptian aid provided to Iraq in this war. Observers also view the Ethiopian-PDRY alliance as being certainly behind this plan, particularly since Libya lost the Chadian border area, adjacent to the Sudan, where the Libyan forces used to send hostile elements into Sudan to act against the regime of President Numayri. Observers also associate troop massing with the escalation of the Eritrean war, which is led by the three liberation fronts who receive supplies via the Sudanese border. The Ethiopian troops adopt the pretext of chasing Eritreans who infiltrate across the border from the Sudan.

ALGERIA

CHADLI BENDJEDID RECEIVES SAUDI FOREIGN MINISTER

LD262358 Algiers Domestic Service in Arabic 2300 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] President Chadli Bendjedid, president of the republic and secretary general of the FLN, received Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal yesterday after [26 May]. The Saudi foreign minister handed him a message from King Khalid ibn 'Abd al-Aziz.

The meeting took place in the presence of Foreign Minister Ahmed Talib Ibrahimi and Culture Minister Abdelmajid Mezian.

Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal arrived in Algiers late yesterday morning [26 May].

FLN DELEGATION LEAVES FOR MOSCOW 26 MAY

LD262250 Algiers Domestic Service in French 2200 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] A large FLN delegation led by M'hamed Yala, member of the Political Bureau and minister of the interior, has left Algiers for Moscow. The delegation will hold political talks with CPSU officials regarding bilateral relations and the current international situation. A protocol of cooperation and a communique will round off the visit.

MAURITANIA

HAYDALA WELCOMES FRANCE'S MITTERRAND 26 MAY

AB261328 Nouakchott Domestic Service in French 0700 GMT 26 May 82

[TExt] French President Francois Mitterrand visited Nouakchott yesterday for a few hours. He was accompanied by his wife and a high-level delegation comprising Louis Mermaz, president of the National Assembly; Jean-Pierre Cot, minister of cooperation and development; Mrs Edwige Avice, minister of youth and sports; and Mrs Yvette Roudy, minister of women's rights.

On his arrival, Mr Mitterrand was welcomed by Lt Col Khouna Ould Haydala, chairman of the Military Committee of National Salvation [CMSN] and head of state; Col Maayouia Ould Sid Ahmed Taya, prime minister and minister of national defense; their wives; members of the CMSN and the government; and other high officials.

After greeting the high-level delegation, the two heads of state exchanged speeches of welcome and thanks in which they reiterated their desire to consolidate bilateral relations. After the exchange of speeches, the two presidents had private talks in the airport's VIP lounge. The private talks were continued at the presidential palace. The talks were followed by a barbecue under a tent given by the chairman of the CMSN and head of state in honor of the French head of state, his wife and the party accompanying them. After the dinner, our guest went to the airport to return to Paris.

Before flying home, the French president held a press conference during which he talked about the question of the Western Sahara, French-Arab relations, and France's role in negotiations between the EEC and the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries.

MOROCCO

CHAMBER OFFICIAL ADDRESSES BULGARIAN DELEGATION

PM250923 Casablanca LE MATIN in French 7 May 82 p 5

[MAP report: "Mr Dey Ould Sidi Baba stresses Algerian-Moroccan nature of northwest African conflict"]

[Text] Rabat -- The Moroccan and Bulgarian parliamentary delegations headed respectively by Chamber of Representatives President Dey Ould Sidi Baba and Bulgarian National Assembly Deputy Chairman Ninko Stefanov held a working meeting at the Chamber of Representatives yesterday morning.

In a speech delivered on that occasion, Mr Dey Ould Sidi Baba gave a brief account of the structure and organization of the Chamber of Representatives and of Morocco's democratic experiment.

Discussing Moroccan-Bulgarian relations, the president of the Chamber of Representatives stressed the need to further extend the relations of cooperation between the two countries in the two peoples' interest.

Discussing the tension prevailing in northwest Africa, Mr Dey Ould Sidi Baba stated that those carrying arms to attack Morocco are not natives of the Sahara. They are, he explained, mercenaries led by the Algerian Army and are carrying out Algeria's directives.

Mr Dey Ould Sidi Baba added that the name "Saharan people" is merely a "trick" aimed at undermining the country's territorial integrity. Morocco, he continued, decided, at the request of some friends, to hold a referendum in the Sahara. The OAU summit, he explained, noted that decision with satisfaction. However, Algeria, which is resorting to maneuvers to have the so-called Saharan Democratic Arab Republic admitted to the OAU through "the odious complicity of the pan-African organization's secretary general, is seriously damaging Africa's unity and stability."

Morocco, which is strongly attached to peace, Mr Dey Ould Sidi Baba stressed, is working tirelessly to avert the danger of the OAU collapsing and to protect it from ideological division.

Mr Ninko Stefanov expressed his country's desire to see Moroccan-Bulgarian cooperation strengthened in the two peoples' mutual interest, specifying that trade between Morocco and Bulgaria exceeded $27 million in 1981. He specified that new forms of cooperation must be sought by both sides in order to extend and give new dynamism to bilateral relations in all spheres, stressing that both countries have broad prospects, especially in the cultural and scientific spheres.

Turning to his country's stance on the Middle East conflict, Mr Stefanov stressed that no just and lasting settlement can be achieved in that region of the world without Israel's complete withdrawal from all the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. Bulgaria, he added, is supporting all actions taken by the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO, their sole legitimate representative, that are aimed at establishing a sovereign Palestinian state.

Bulgaria, which advocates the solution of international conflicts by peaceful means, he added, is working to safeguard the process of detente, peace, and good-neighborliness in international relations.

Following the speech by the deputy chairman of the Bulgarian National Assembly, several deputies made speeches highlighting the unanimity of Moroccan public opinion and political parties on the Sahara issue and the determination of Morocco, the king, the government and the people, to defend the country's territorial integrity.

TUNISIA

SAUDI FOREIGN MINISTER BRINGS ARAB UNITY MESSAGE

LD270730 Tunis Domestic Service in Arabic 0600 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] The foreign minister of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, His Royal Highness Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, arrived in Tunis last night carrying a message from King Khalid ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz to President Habib Bourguiba.

In a statement following his arrival, Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal reaffirmed that it is no secret that the situation, especially in the present circumstances, requires a unified attitude with which the Arab countries can face the problems confronting them. He pointed out that the message he was carrying relates to this issue and falls within the framework of continuous coordination between Tunisia and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. He described relations between the two countries as excellent.

The Saudi foreign minister also spoke about the question of Egypt's return to the Arab fold, and pointed out that such a return cannot be realized through common will alone but also requires circumstances and justifications by which Egypt's return to the Arab arena will result in the Arab nation's solidarity -- in contrast to when Egypt left the arena. He expressed hope that owing to the importance of this matter the Arab states will decide on this issue at levels of responsibility and legitimacy and will bring about Arab unanimity.

KENYA

KANU COUNCIL ENDORSES ODINGA'S EXPULSION

EA262148 Nairobi Domestic Service in English 1600 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The KANU national governing council under the chairmanship of His Excellency President Daniel arap Moi today endorsed the expulsion of Mr Oginga Odinga and his follower, Mr George Moseti Anyona, from the ruling party. In doing this, the governing council noted that Odinga and Anyona had shown their actions, that they are working against the interests of KANU.

The council further noted that discipline is vital within any society, and within KANU, and that those unable to follow these principles had removed themselves from the party. Observing that KANU has been steering the affairs of the nation since independence, and that since the country is a de facto one-party state, the national governing council directed that the position be legalized and that KANU parliamentary group and the attorney general take immediate action.

The 3-hour marathon council meeting which continued over lunch hours expressed its total loyalty to the president and pledged undivided and total support to him, the ruling party and the government.

The council meeting was described by the secretary general of KANU, Mr Robert Matano, as very successful and fruitful. He also noted that Kenya's economy had flourished despite the world recession and has been able to guarantee food for its people when other developing nations are unable to feed themselves. Speaking to newsmen after the crucial meeting, Mr Matano, flanked by the national organizing secretary, Mr Nathan Munoko, and the assistant secretary general, Mr Maina Wanjigi, said: The national governing council meeting, which was preceded by the executive meeting, discussed various issues of the party which included revitalization of the ruling party.

In this respect, the secretary general said the governing council had elected a revitalization committee under the chairmanship of the vice president of the country and the party, Mr Mwai Kibaki. The committee will review procedures of recruitment of members and ways of revitalizing the party in general. The secretary general said the revitalization committee will also ensure that party funds are safeguarded.

In its 11 resolutions the governing council also called on party branches to hold public meetings and explain to the people the objectives of the KANU policy. The governing council further noted with satisfaction the efforts being made by His Excellency President Daniel arap Moi in this field of soil conservation and urged all branches to follow this example within their branches.

The council called for greater cooperation between government officials from KANU in order to ensure maximum development. It urged the government to accelerate its program of Kenyanization in the country's economy, particularly in the fields of commerce and industry.

The national governing council further appealed to the contry's students, particularly those at the University of Nairobi, to concentrate on their studies and refuse to be dragged into politics. The council fully appreciated the devotion of the president to the service of the country and Mother Africa and expressed satisfaction at the stability and peace that continues to prevail in Kenya despite the difficulties the world is facing economically.

CONGO

GABONESE PRESIDENT ARRIVES IN BRAZZAVILLE 26 MAY

AB261315 Paris AFP in English 1204 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Brazzaville, 26 May (AFP) -- President Omar Bongo of Gabon arrived here today for talks with Congolese President Denis Sassou Nguesso, national radio reported.

President Bongo came from Angola, where he had paid a brief visit.

FOREIGN MINISTER COMMENTS ON INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

AB261730 Paris AFP in French 1407 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Brazzaville, 26 May (AFP) -- "The Congolese Government is fully aware that all the objectives of the OAU have not been achieved and colonialism, racism, apartheid and exploitation in particular still prevail," Congolese Foreign Minister Pierre Nze stated on the occasion of the 19th anniversary of the OAU.

The Congolese Government believes, however, that the OAU remains the "most appropriate" body for consulation and dialogue, the privileged tool of struggle and fighting in the service in African liberation and progress, the minister indicated.

Mr Nze reaffirmed the "active solidarity" of his government with the "martyred" people of Palestine. Africa, he said, has stood in support of the Palestinian people and has massively broken all relations with the people of Israel.

The Congolese Government will join efforts with Arab countries and the PLO to seek ways and means of increasing the Palestinian people's capability of resistance and riposte, Mr Nze added in substance.

The Congo calls on African countries "to avoid all divisive attempts which the OAU is facing, to resolutely mobilize themselves in support of any unitary move toward African liberation," the minister went on to say. He stressed that the government associates itself with any move likely to consolidate the unity of the continent. At the same time he hailed the SDAR's admission to the OAU.

For the Congolese Government, Mr Nze added, the upcoming OAU summit in Tripoli will mark an important period for the consolidation of the unity and the liberation of Africa.

Lastly, the minister pledged the Congolese Government's solidarity with the Argentine people, but he held the view that every effort must be made to find a negotiated settlement to that crisis.

In conclusion, the minister said the Congolese Government "similarly supports all efforts within the Nonaligned Movement to make the upcoming nonaligned summit a great moment for consultations among the organizations of nonaligned countries in the face of aggressive imperialist action."

GHANA

ASAMOAH LEADS DELEGATION TO NONALIGNED MEETING

AB270814 Accra Domestic Serive in English 0700 GMT 27 May 82

[Text] A three-man government delegation led by the PNDC [Provincial National Defense Council] secretary for foreign affairs, Dr Obed Asamoah, left Accra last night to attend the nonaligned foreign ministers meeting which opens in Havana, Cuba, next Monday [31 May]. Dr Asamoah told newsmen before the delegation left that the conference is of particular importance to Ghana as it will afford it the chance of explaining the situation in the country to member states and seek their support and solidarity for the revolution.

Matters to be discussed at the 5-day conference include the new international economic order, world trade and how it affects the developing countries. Others are disarmament, the arms race, the southern African problem and the conflict in the Gulf area, Falkland Islands, the Middle East and the Chad and Western Sahara conflict.

IRAN TO SUPPLY OIL, EXPLORATION EXPERTISE

AB260245 Accra Domestic Service in English 1800 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Steps are being taken to enable Iran to supply Ghana with oil and technical expertise in oil exploration. Ghana will in turn export cocoa, timber, wood products and minerals to Iran. This was disclosed to newsmen at Kotoka International Airport by Mr Hoseyn Lavasani, leader of the seven-man Iranian delegation shortly before the delegation flew to Lagos after a 3-day visit to Ghana. The delegation held discussions on Ghana-Iran relations and the expansion of trade between the two countries with the PNDC [Provincial National Defense Council] secretaries for foreign affairs, trade and fuel and power.

Mr Lavasani noted that the peoples of Iran and Ghana, among other Third World countries, have suffered from suppression by colonialists and the imperialists and the only way to achieve freedom and self-dignity is by increased cooperation and trade among such countries. To this end, he said, Iran is now relying heavily on other Third World countries for her imports. Mr Lavasani observed that there are similarities in the Ghana-Iranian revolution because the two countries seek to eliminate foreign domination. In the Gulf war, Mr Lavasani repeated his country's demand for an unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Iranian soil and the payment of compensation for human losses.

GUINEA

PRIME MINISTER RECEIVES CHEDLI KLIBI MESSAGE

AB261701 Paris AFP in French 0921 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Dakar, 26 May (AFP) -- On Tuesday [25 May] Guinea Prime Minister Lansana Beavogui received Yusif 'Ali Nayif, who brought a message from Chedli Klibi, the secretary general of the Arab League, to Guinean head of state Ahmed Sekou Toure, it was announced on Tuesday night by Radio Conakry monitored in Dakar.

The contents of the message were not disclosed. The Guinea radio simply added that the Arab League envoy and Mr Beavogui held talks "on current ticklish issues (without saying which ones) with respect to Arab-African cooperation in particular."

Also, the Guinea prime minister received a Libyan Government delegation led by Muhammad 'Ali Sabu, general manager of Libya's bank for agricultural development and chairman of the Guinea-Libya Friendship Association. Conakry radio did not state the purpose of the visit, but it indicated that Mr Sabu was made a commander of the Guinea National Order by Mr Beavogui.

IVORY COAST

MITTERRAND 21 MAY ABIDJAN DINNER SPEECH

AB262133 Paris Diplomatic Information Service in French 1400 GMT 26 May 82

[French President Francois Mitterrand's speech at a dinner given in his honor in Abidjan by President Houphouet-Boigny on 21 May 1982]

[Excerpts] Mr President, Madam, ladies and gentlemen: Few countries are united by so many close ties as the Ivory Coast and France. The ties have been woven throughout a common history marked by the ambiguities of the colonial period from which you have retained and benefited from the best aspects, thus safeguarding the future solidarity between eqaul and sovereign partners.

The Ivory Coast, among the African countries south of the Sahara, is our first partner in cooperation because you have always chosen to go along with us. In this regard and by mutual agreement, numerous Frenchmen have chosen to come and work in your country; many Ivorians live in France where they study or work. There are exchanges of people. In a nutshell, there is a network of friendships and relations which ensure that Ivorians and Frenchmen are no longer foreigners to each other and they feel as brothers.

As for France, it intends to continue and improve the common action and to respond to the trust put on it. Our cooperation must be adapted to better satisfy the new requirements resulting from our own progress. I will add that because of the world crisis you have just mentioned, the Ivory Coast is facing extra difficulties. You know France has not shirked its duty. I say it will not shirk its duty in the future and it will do everything possible to help its friend, the Ivory Coast, to overcome its economic difficulties.

Do I have to say that -- it does not even seem necessary to me, perhaps simple for those abroad who might not hear us tonight -- if the clauses of our other agreements, in particular with respect to our mutual defense, were to be examined, the Ivory Coast would find France by its side as your fathers and brothers were by ours in the difficult times. The quality of relations between France and the Ivory Coast is based not only on friendship and reciprocal interests, it is also based on identical views on fundamental issues prevailing in history, the trend of world current events. This identity of views can be seen -- as we have realized on several occasions and for quite a long time -- in our approach to the issue of North-South relations. For us, you and me, the future of world peace depends in fact on these relations if one has broad views. As you know, my country, aware of the importance of the issue, has decided to increase its public aid in the next few years to 0.7 percent of its GNP in conformity with UN recommendations. France also wishes to streamline its assistance in order to grant priority to self-centered development likely to really satisfy the essential needs of the population and to strengthen the autonomy of the beneficiary countries instead of increasing their dependence.

The action of a few countries is not enough: A problem of such scope calls for collective awareness at the world level and lasting solutions require a consensus, common commitment in the community of nations. That is why, whenever I have had the opportunity to express myself, beginning with my first speech a year ago; that is why at the first conference of industrial countries in Ottawa, and then in Cancun; that is why at every conference where I gave a speech as I will in a few days in Versailles during the second phase of the conference in question, I have championed the thesis that global negotiations must begin within the framework of the United Nations, and not just because it was necessary to be or speak in unison with Third World countries.

Of course, charged with defending the interests of my country I may not say the same thing as your countries on some issues. But I think they are right when they speak of development, because that problem must be tackled in all its dimensions. Also, since there are institutions created through agreements or particular treaties, in particular in the wake of World War II, such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, which sponsor top-level discussions at the international level, all this must be organized so that we all progress at the same pace and in the same direction if we want the two main dangers threatening the very existence of mankind -- that is nucelar proliferation and the widening of the gulf between rich and poor countries -- to be checked, and they can be checked because it depends on man's intelligence in mastering material.

Global negotiations, the United Nations, other institutions -- these are what we must rally round if, as we near the next century, we want to give our children a chance to live in harmony. The negotiations in question must lead to an increase in food assistance and satisfactory administration of this assistance at the world level. One must seek to achieve self-sufficiency in food, which will be possible. It has already been achieved in a very few countries once considered Third World through the development of science, research and technology, but above all through the hard work, knowledge and experience of the individuals who constitute the deep tissue of a country like this one, the people you precisely called farmers, from whom the Ivorian society is being constructed and whose traditions, teachings and culture will outlive this society's own technology. Even when you have reached the industrial phase -- you will soon reach it -- it is these very values that will ensure this altered society its permanence as regards values likely to lift up man -- I know you are seeing to that. To this end, concrete problems, practical problems must be examined. Self-sufficiency in food will be possible only if farmers and states are furnished with means for applied research likely to increase production capacity while developing commercial systems to enable exchanges.

Our role is precisely to fertilize abandonded lands and to restore to the mind, to the strength and richness of the mind, all the power and immense opportunities available to those who want them. [sentence as received] It is therefore because I feel it is my duty and because I believe it is the expression of an inner desire of France that I want my country to not only announce the future, but also to prepare for it. This of course is possible within the limit of our means. That is why I said it is the whole world which must finally be convinced that it is the step to take.

As far as we are concerned, for example, we become worried when a country which is our friend, a country to which we speak firmly and freely, that is, the United States, withdraws from international institutions whenever it becomes a matter of leaning towards the Third World; I deplore this sort of withdrawal, this choice and priority given to East-West relations; the questioning of U.S. aid plans; the upsetting, the grounding or the breaking up of a whole series of programs which had been drawn up for the poorest countries.

After the majority followed the United States in reducing their quotas, a few countries -- I must mention France and the Scandinavian countries first -- decided to maintain their entire contribution. I must say that Great Britain, in spite of it own difficulties, honors part of its international obligations and has made a similar decision with regard to India, in particular. But not the others. I will say the same thing in Versailles to the friendly powers who will be meeting there that this call must be heard, otherwise the gap will widen and the new dissent will make trouble, the breaking of relations, wandering and fanatism a more common language than our own.

I have to say it here, because in a country like the Ivory Coast, one is permitted to say it without fear and without ever the feeling of teaching a lesson. It is sometimes difficult to address poor countries, very poor countries and tell them what I have just said -- as if we were a power, a West European power, a titular power ready to impose itself when it should not. And it is easy to say this in a country like yours, because nothing has been achieved, would not have been achieved, if you had not made the necessary effort to organize, work, produce and display organized intelligence. You have a remarkable example which I must praise. But nothing will be achieved if the majority of the African people, and particularly those in Black Africa, do not begin with energy resources and make the needed efforts; then the richer countries will surely come to their aid. We cannot leave the economies of millions and millions of people at the mercy of those speculators whom you denounced a short while ago. To believe that there is a free market law is to ignore everything about the strings of the modern world.

We, the French, are not forced, within the framework of our governmental action, to ignore or to fight the true, natural and honest forces of the market. But what we cannot accept is a vocabulary which in reality hides the setting up of a system whose aim is to first reduce, and then destroy, under the guise of innovation and ideology, everything that represents the economic freedom of men and the freedom of exchange.

Some sovereign economic powers appear on the world horizon. The decision depends and will depend on them. They should build a free and true market and not the type manipulated by the speculators of London, Chicago and New York. Mr President, it is necessary to say that when people play with the price of coffe, it is not that its price has undergone some fluctuation as a result of honest competition. It is because some people have decided to make money with no care for the fate of you producing states. I believe a just harmony between true market laws, when there is competition, corresponds to reality and to a planning system in which nations and individuals within each nation can organize themselves, not to build an oppressive group but to serve the interests of each individual in his natural units: his family, community, enterprise and business.

My country belongs to an alliance. It is therefore, as people say, in one of the blocs. This is not its desire, as it wants the progressive but simultaneous disappearance of blocs. We are faithful to our alliances and our commitments. We have made our own choice of means to ensure our own independence. This means that when I affirm France's particular call to understand Third World problems, I do not mean to create a gap in the ties which, in this world we live in, bind us to our allies. This is because East-West ties cannot cover North-South relations. France only wants to get out of this vicious circle in order to convince those industrialized countries who will listen to it to join France and to embark upon a freely determined program for the development of the Third World.

NIGERIA

QUESTION OF RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL EXAMINED

AB261015 Lagos International Service in English 0930 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] The director general of the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs, Prof Bolage Akinyemi, has said in Lagos that it will not be right for Nigeria to establish diplomatic relations with Israel now. Discussing this to members of the National Assembly yesterday, Professor Akinyemi said that the question of resumption of links with Israel should be viewed beyond the 1973 OAU decision since there had been developments which have introduced other factors worthy of consideration. He said one of such factors was the development that has taken place in the Israeli-South African relationship since 1973. The director general said that at this present period of economic crisis, it is not the right time to antagonize the Arab world when Saudi Arabia has the capacity to produce so much crude oil to punish Nigeria for any revision of her Israeli policy.

Professor Akinyemi said, however, that if Israel was prepared to sever its military links with South Africa, Nigeria should be prepared to go to the OAU to ask for the reconsideration of its 1972 decision.

SENEGAL

MORE ON FRENCH PRESIDENT MITTERRAND'S VISIT

Speech in Saint-Louis

AB251525 Paris AFP in French 1256 GMT 25 May 82

[Text] Saint-Louis, 25 May (AFP) -- President Francois Mitterrand has announced in Saint-Louis that he has decided to reestablish the payment of pension to the wives and orphans of former African servicemen who served in the French Army. "Statutory measures," he said "will make it possible to pay all arrears very soon."

The French head of state also announced the forthcoming increase in pensions "to take into account the rising cost of living." "We will also pursue the policy of harmonizing rates thus reducing inequalities in treatment arising from the conditions pertaining to each of the [word indistinct]," he added.

"In any case I can assure you," the French head of state said, "that maximum efforts will be made within the limits of our budgetary possibilities which cannot be stretched indefinitely."

Referring to the issue of the defense of human rights, President Mitterrand recalled Frence's "solemn and resolute" commitment to help "all those who are deprived of the sacred rights of a human being." "I find it pleasant to observe," the French president said, "that one of the first factors contributing to the very close unity between France and Senegal is their common attachment to the defense of human rights." He then went on to advocate the strengthening of French-Senegalese relations "for the greatest benefit of progress and peace in Africa and in the world."

Next, the French head of state recalled the role France has to play in the search for "better balance between the rich and the poor."

The only answer, according to him, which seems efficient is "closer solidarity between the North and the South" which translates into well-organized markets, the maintenence of and "if possible increased" public aid to development and a policy of development "that would be more suited to satisfying the essential needs of the people."

Finally President Mitterrand announced what France intends to do to achieve these results, that is: global negotiations within the framework of the United Nations, the stabilization of the prices of raw materials and [encouragement of] self-sufficiency in food production.

Press Conference

AB261125 Dakar Domestic Service in French 2000 GMT 25 May 82

[Press conference by French President Francois Mitterrand before his departure from Dakar at the end of his official visit on 25 May -- recorded]

[Text] [Mitterrand] I have met with heads of state who understand France well, that is to say heads of state who love France and who wish to deepen their relations with my country. We have some important cooperation projects which are being implemented. Sometimes the demands are quite (?big) and this is normal. I say yes whenever I am in a position to do so. I have already said that the projects should fit into my country's own prospects and that our resources are not unlimited. I have noticed that the heads of state -- and for the moment I am referring particularly to those who received me -- have a very clear and rigorous idea of their role, that is, they are endeavoring to make this cooperation as useful as possible whether immediately or in the future. Therefore, I have never met with any leader whose demands were unrealistic.

How should this aid be adapted to ensure that it produces fruitful investments as soon as possible and a better adapted training scheme? Apart from the direct role it is playing, France also has the role of a middleman and sometimes even of an advocate in the international institutions. One could mention particularly the progress made on various occasions because France intervened at the IMF at the request of certain countries. The IMF often imposes (?very hard) and sometimes quite complicated conditions as far as economy and particularly human economy are concerned. [as heard] France has very great experience in this field. [passage indistinct] I did not meet any difficulty in my discussions in any of the countries I just mentioned and especially the three Black African countries I visited. I mean Niger, the Ivory Coast and Senegal. The projects we set up are those which should normally be very (?fruitful) [words indistinct].

I am very pleased with my trip which, as you know, is only the first of a series of visits I intend to make to all the French-speaking countries and later to other countries in Africa.

[Question] Mr President, you recently signed an agreement with Algeria -- an agreement on gas which is a revolutionary one because France is paying an equitable price for a product from a Third World country. Is socialist France going to make this a principle and will this agreement serve as an example for all products from the developing countries?

[Answer] I have already had the opportunity to say in another country that this is quite a regular practice. France very often intervenes in order to support as much as it can the prices of some raw materials, but this was not really the case with Algerian gas. [passage indistinct] As I have already explained, the price we agreed upon is an average price which is very reasonable. To take another example, we are buying uranium in Niger at a higher price than the current world price. We sometimes do this for a certain number of products. However, we cannot do this for all products. This is obvious: France hasn't got the means to pay prices which are in conformity with the production costs of (?all products). [passage indistinct] I repeat that France cannot claim to be able -- nobody should ever imagine that France is in a position to guarantee the prices of raw materials, for example. It can offer assistance. These are aids.

[Question] Mr President, this is a question concerning East-West detente. Since you are attached to East-West relations as well as to security, how do you explain your four meetings in 1 year with President Ronald Reagan and none with Leonid Brezhnev?

[Answer] If you understand the circumstances [words indistinct], you will know that I met with Mr Reagan within the framework of international conferences with the exception of my recent trip to Washington where I spent half a day. Mr Reagan and I met on the occasion of international conferences. [passage indistinct] I met with Mr Reagan on the occasion of international negotiations. The first was in Ottawa, Canada, within the framework of the summit conference of the industrialized countries. It so happens that the United States is a member of this conference whereas the Soviet Union is not. I would have met with Mr Brezhnev if the Soviet Union had been a member of this organization. The second meeting was in Cancun and 22 countries took part in it but the Soviet Union was not represented. [passage indistinct]

[Question] Mr President, what do you think about the union established between Senegal and Gambia, (?which is being consolidated)?

[Answer] The problem of Gambia does not concern France. This concerns only the two countries involved. France is a declared friend of Senegal and it has sympathy for Senegal's objectives, be they political or defense objectives. But France is not concerned about the problem of the union between Senegal and Gambia. I have no opinion to offer on this matter. [passage indistinct]

[Question] Mr President, we have learned that you will soon receive President Sekou Toure in France. Do you think this visit is compatible with the respect and defense of human rights of which you talked so well this morning?

[Answer] President Sekou Toure is president of the Republic of Guinea, which takes part in organizations of which France also is a member [words indistinct]. It is good that relations between France and Guinea should be improved. We also have historical relations and obligations toward that country and its head of state could be received any time in Paris like any other head of state.

[Question on U.S. arms supplies to Morocco mostly indistinct]

[Answer] We have no dispute with Morocco. Our relations with Morocco are good. [passage indistinct] Morocco has its problems and we have ours. Concerning its armaments, if Morocco wants to enter into transactions with France, it can do so. [passage indistinct] We are safeguarding our traditional friendship with Morocco and we hope it will continue to develop. I am sorry to say that Morocco's political objectives and its relations with other countries are its own concern and not mine. [passage indistinct]

[Question] Mr President, this is the last question. Mr President, you are a champion of the interests of the Third World countries. What is your country's stand concerning the conflict in the Falkland Islands [words indistinct]. Some observers have been wondering how you can reconcile the defense of the interests of the Third World peoples and your country's more or less unconditional support for Great Britain in this conflict? [passage indistinct]

[Answer] I have already had the opportunity to talk about this problem the day before yesterday [words indistinct]. What I can say is that France has an alliance with Great Britain, which is moreover the closest country to France through geography and community of interests [words indistinct]. France and Great Britain have always (?come together) during tragic moments as in the last two world wars. It is our duty to be by the side of Great Britain whenever it faces great difficulties. [passage indistinct]

Visit Ends

AB252107 Dakar Domestic Service in French 2000 GMT 25 May 82

[Excerpts] French President Francois Mitterrand and his wife have ended their visit to Senegal. They have just left Dakar, the last stage of their African journey. They were seen off at the airport by President Abdou Diouf and his wife, the prime minister, the speaker of the National Assembly, the chairman of the Economic and Social Council, members of government and of the diplomatic corps and several important personalities.

DIOUF ON RELATIONS WITH FRANCE, OTHER TOPICS

LD251554 Paris Domestic Service in French 1720 GMT 19 May 82

[Interview with President Abdou Diouf on "Facing the Public" program presented by Gilbert Denoyan, with Christian Casteran of LE MATIN, Pierre Ledenteque of Ouest-France, Paul Nahon of Channel-2 and (Thierry Seguillon) of Temoinages Chretiens -- voices of questioners not identifiable — in Senegal -- time not given -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Question] Mr President, you are a socialist, and France has also been socialist for a year now -- it has a left government. Has this changed relations between Dakar and Paris?

[Answer] The relations between Dakar and Paris have always been excellent; we have always spoken of privileged cooperation, but the fact that the two countries are led by socialist governments certainly has an impact on the quality of this cooperation, and we can say that since Mr Francois Mitterrand has been leading France, new life has been breathed into this cooperation between France and Senegal.

[Question] Mr President, could you tell us more precisely what has changed in cooperation between France and Senegal and between France and Africa since 10 May?

[Answer] As I said, there has been no qualitative change, but there has been a change in the way to approach problems.

[Question] But on the French side we gained the impression that there has been a certain change. For example, new friendships have been established with Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, on the one hand, and on the other hand, stress has been laid on cooperation with the Maghreb. For example, in the case of the gas contract with Algeria, part of the cooperation budget, among other things, was cut to pay the surcharge for this gas. Are you not afraid this expansion toward Africa will leave in abeyance what was up to now privileged cooperation with the countries of French-speaking Black Africa?

[Answer] Yes, this fear has or has not been formulated [as heard] by many African heads of state, but I can say that in Senegal we have not felt any decrease in the quality of French development aid to Senegal, quite the contrary.

[Question] Don't certain positions of the French Socialist Party, if not of the government, risk in the end making French-Senegalese cooperation more difficult; for example, the Socialist Party's wish not to maintain French troops in Africa, or perhaps the party's support for the Polisario?

[Answer] We do not think so. Each government is sovereign and determines its policy independently. We are not asking Paris to maintain the same positions as Senegal on all problems and neither does France ask Senegal to maintain the same position as France on all problems.

[Question] Yes, Mr President. Do you think the French Government elected on 10 May has a new approach to what cooperation between a rich and a poor country, such as Senegal, should be?

[Answer] Yes, we have this clear impression. For example, we have the impression of a clearer awareness of the need to speed up the establishment of a more just international economic order, and we think more and more that France is a prominent advocate for the Third World facing the other industrialized countries.

[Question] Have there been concrete results in the field since 10 May?

[Answer] These things take time, you know. These things cannot be done by a wave of a magic wand, but we believe President Francois Mitterrand and his team are very eloquent and tenacious advocates, and very persevering. Thus we think that sooner or later this will lead to results, but it will take time.

[Question] Mr President, within this team one gets the impression -- I am speaking a little sketchily -- that there are two schools. For example, Mr Jean-Pierre Cot, who is minister of cooperation with former colonies, often talks about the need for self-focused development for the Third World countries, while Mr Cheysson seems to talk of the advantages, to reuse expressions which date from before 10 May, of something which rather resembles the three-way dialogue, with the recycling of oil money and the opening of Third World markets, in which Western countries must invest more. Between these two schools which I have mentioned rather sketchily, where would you place yourself, you who are very much from the Third World side?

[Answer] In my view these two schools are complementary. I do not want to intervene in an internal French debate but I think it is complementary. Certainly, we will achieve nothing without a self-docused development. From this point of view I share the opinion of Mr Jean-Pierre Cot, but this self-focused development itself calls for substantial means which do not exclude assistance from abroad. Here lies the importance to be attached to a three-way dialogue and and the recycling of oil money, as well as to other means to be made available to us to enable us to pursue self-focused development.

[Question] Mr President, President Mitterrand chose to make his first trip to Africa with a visit to Senegal and to the Ivory Coast in particular. Certain people in Paris see in this choice the fact that continuity is winning over change. Can you think why, in your opinion, President Mitterrand chose to come to Senegal on his first trip to Africa?

[Answer] In my opinion, it is because Senegal is considered one of the privileged allies, the most privileged allies of France in Africa, and that whatever the color of the government in France, this is a reality which cannot be ignored.

[Question] But not because the French Socialist Party and the Senegalese Socialist Party have relations?

[Answer] I do not think so because there is no socialist party governing Niger; nor is there a socialist party governing the Ivory Coast.

[Question] No, but the Socialist Party governs here in Senegal. You said everything was going well between France and Senegal, even before 10 May, but you think relations have improved since Francois Mitterrand has headed the French state. What do you expect, precisely, from the improvement in these relations between you and the French president?

[Answer] We expect from France a greater degree of understanding for our problems. When I said our relations have always been excellent, this does not mean all our needs have always been taken into consideration, that all our requests have always been examined with all the understanding desired. With the new French Government we are sure we will have this advantage, this privilege.

[Question] What will this affect? Precisely what sort of aid do you expect from France? What do you expect precisely from the improvement of relations between you and the French president?

[Answer] At the moment we need France to continue its normal aid to Senegal through the central fund, through technical assistance and so forth. But we also want France to give us substantial special aid, because at the moment we are facing major economic difficulties and we need more special aid from France to face these difficulties.

We also need France to plead our case with other friendly industrial countries, and with international financial bodies such as the IMF, which, it must be admitted, do not always understand the problems of our countries and the constraints we face. This is why we think understanding between the two governments, between the two heads of state in particular, should enable us to secure these various results upon which Senegal is counting....

[Question] France would rather be like the advocate of your cause, of the Senegalese cause, but also of others....

[Answer] ...of the cause of Africa and the Third World....

[Question] ...among the Europeans in particular....

[Answer] ...and within the international financial bodies; once again I will mention the IMF and the World Bank.

[Question] Yes, Mr President, very frankly, since the Cancun summit on North-South problems, has anything changed in the policy or aid from rich countries to poor countries?

[Answer] Frankly no, but I think something is moving slowly, but has not yet been translated into real results.

[Question] What, in your opinion, is blocking this mechanism? Is there a country which is blocking it, or countries?

[Answer] I am sure there are countries blocking it, but I can tell you that in the vanguard of countries wanting to make progress there is France.

[Question] But who is blocking this, Mr President?

[Answer] The other countries, but not all others.

[Question] Does the United States have a particular responsibility?

[Answer] It seems to me that the United States does not have the open and benevolent attitude it could have toward problems of this kind, as was shown by the recent meeting to reallocate resources of the International Development Association [IDA] where the United States was behind the other countries. This led Mr Jacques Delors to suggest setting up another version of the IDA to enable those countries which want to help our countries more, by means of flexible aid, such as IDA aid, to show their hand in practice, since the United States does not want to follow the trend. Here again I do not want to criticize a friendly country. I take the opportunity to say we have good bilateral cooperation with the United States, but you asked me a question and I replied.

[Question] Quite so, Mr President, with the United States it seems that since Ronald Reagan has been in the White House, the Americans regard Africa differently. They are perhaps a little more interested in it than under previous administrations, and perhaps that acts against certain strategies and certain developments. Does it seem to you that Ronald Reagan is perhaps an element slowing down a development, the beginning of which could be seen a few years ago and which now seems a bit stalled.

[Answer] Yes, I think that the school of thought to which Mr Reagan belongs, on which Mr Reagan bases himself. is certainly not the school of thought which allows for much more generous aid to the underdeveloped countries.

[Question] More precisely, Mr President, as regards Morocco, for example, what do you think of the new type of cooperation between the United States and Morocco? For example, I believe that $30 million in 1982 and $100 million in 1983 is allocated to military aid?

[Answer] But I think it is a good thing, since Morocco is a friendly country going through difficulties and which needs military aid. I cannot criticize the increase in American military aid to Morocco.

[Question] But how can anyone simultaneously fear Soviet penetration, as many Africans states do, and not fear that on the other side there should be the same type of penetration?

[Answer] It is a real risk, but the problem, as usual, is to see who started it. When you ask Moroccan officials they will tell you they were surprised at the sophisticated weapons of the Polisario, and this sophisticated weaponry certainly came from somewhere. Morocco is therefore obliged to defend itself. Once again I do not want to go into the fundamentals of the debate. The Senegalese stand on the Saharan problem is known. We are for self-determination of the Saharan people, and we think the only way to resolve this problem is to once again hold a referendum to enable the Saharan people to distinctly and clearly pronounce their choice.

[Question] Is there not a risk that East-West realities could assume important dimensions in this conflict over Western Sahara?

[Answer] It is a very serious risk, and you know this risk is now splitting the OAU. We are trying to do everything possible to ward off this peril, but it is a real rask, as you said.

[Question] Mr President, concerning the interplay of the great powers in Africa, I believe your predecessor, President Senghor, said "He who holds Africa, holds Europe." I would like to ask you if this maxim, this judgment, is still valid today, and if you share it?

[Answer] It is still valid today. I share it, as I share many of the opinions of President Senghor, of whom I am a great disciple.

[Question] But who holds Africa today?

[Answer] I think Africa is a stake at the moment. People are trying to hold it, and I think Africa must see that it remains truely nonaligned.

[Question] What are the best placed among the great powers in Africa at the moment?

[Answer] I can tell you France has a major role to play in maintaining Africa in its nonaligned role, and Europe in particular has a big role to play. If Europe does not abandon us, if Europe is truly conscious of the strategic interest represented by Africa, not just for Europe, but for the balance and peace of the world, I think the great powers will not be able to take a hold on Africa to the point of removing its independence, its dignity or of disturbing the world balance.

[Question] Syrely the Africans themselves still have a responsibility for this Soviet and American penetration [words indistinct] in Africa, and the fact that Africa risks becoming the theater of an East-West intrigue.

[Answer] Yes....

[Question] It is obvious that the great powers are playing on weaknesses and on inter-African quarrels.

[Answer] I am in complete agreement with you.

[Question] What solution do you see to this?

[Answer] The only solution is the one I indicated to you: much stronger and much more coherent African unity, a rejection of any hegemony, wherever it comes from, and much more developed cooperation with Europe.

[Question] It seems to us rather that all these are pious wishes.

[Answer] I am alone. I can tell you what I can do, but I cannot do things in the place of the 50 -- of the 49 other African heads of state. I can advise them, I can even, presumptiously, tell them what I think, and I can act on the level of my state in a coherent way in the direction of nonalignment, but I cannot put myself in their place.

[Question] There is cause for concern for the lack of cohesion between African states, since we do not even know whether the OAU meeting in July will take place, and the king of Morocco stated his anxiety on this topic on a recent "Facing the Public" program. This week, too, with Zaire's recognition of the State of Israel, which will again divide Africans, is there not a sort of incoherence here as well, an impossibility of finding a common path for Africans?

[Answer] Yes, this is also my point of view. There was already a split on one issue, that of the Sahara, and I expressed publicly the fear that the OAU meeting in Tripoli might not be held. Then a new issue emerged, the problem of Israel and its relations with Africa with the gesture just made by Zaire. I take this opportunity, moreover, to say that for Senegal there is no question of following this example, and that for us, so long as the basis of the problem is not solved, we will not renew our relations with Israel.

[Question] But would not the return of Israel to the African scene be a good means of countering what is called Libyan expansionism?

[Answer] I do not link the two problems. I see Israel in relation to the Palestinian problem; it is a problem of justice. The Palestinian people have the right to a homeland, to an independent state on Palestinian territory. We cannot have normal relations with Israel until this problem is settled. The Libyan problem is different. We believe Libya has behaved up to now as a hegemonistic state in its relations with other African states.

[Question] [Words indistinct] destabilizing, Mr President?

[Answer] Yes destabilizing, to that I can testify. As for Senegal, luckily these threats and these attempts at destabilization did not produce the expected results.

[Question] Mr President, as regards these inter-African rivalries, do you still have the same fears about Al-Qadhdhafi, now that Libya has withdrawn from Chad? I would like to ask you, will you attend the OAU summit which is to be held in Tripoli in July, if it is still held in Tripoli?

[Answer] I do not expect to go to the Tripoli summit while the problem of the SDAR [Saharan Democratic Arab Republic] the so-called SDAR, remains unresolved. I do not expect to sit at the same table as the SDAR delegation, because I consider its admission illegal, illegitimate and politically improper.

[Question] How do you intend to get out of the impasse, Mr President? Will it be by holding an extraordinary summit of the OAU which you seemed to envisage at one time?

[Answer] I did propose it, but there is very little chance of it happening, because we would need two-thirds of the members to accept such an extraordinary summit. There is another solution. Mr al-Qadhdhafi and Mr arap Moi, current chairman of the OAU, could make a solemn declaration assuring the heads of state of the SDAR's nonparticipation at the Tripoli summit, then we could go to Tripoli so as not to consummate the break-up of the OAU.

[Question] But it seemed that Al-Qadhdhafi was making an effort at goodwill. I believe he did not attend the conference of Saharan countries, and he hoped the declaration closing that conference would not embarrass African countries. So, should there not be an effort somehow to encourage the goodwill of Colonel al-Qadhdhafi, who must not want to find himself in 2 months the current chairman of an OAU with a large part of its members cut off?

[Answer] I think Colonel al-Qadhdhafi is an intelligent man, and that certainly he will do everything possible to save the Tripoli summit. There will be a tactical change which will enable the OAU summit to be saved and to ensure him the current chairmanship of this body for a year. I do not know what he will pull out of the hat, but he is certainly capable of doing something to enable the OAU to be saved. I do not know what. In any case I, with many African heads of state, am ready to join in all efforts which can be made to save this OAU summit.

[Question] Do you not think, Mr President [words indistinct] since the Africans are somewhat vulnerable today, faced as they are with the attempts at destabilization made by such as Al-Qadhdhafi, that Africa and leaders are at crossroads, a turning point, [words indistinct] you are a young head of state, you represent the new generation, those who did not necessarily work for independence because they were too young, and there is perhaps difficulty in finding a way in Africa which arouses sufficient response to speak practically on behalf of everyone?

[Answer] Yes, I do not know whether in Africa there was ever a way to arouse sufficient response to speak for everyone. Since we have been independent, there have always been splits, I would say. Do you remember the beginnings of African unity when there was the Monrovia group and the Casablanca group? In 1963 we had to overcome these differences to succeed in forming the OAU, but there have always been what you journalists have called moderates and progressives. Thus I think it will be very difficult to obtain a consensus on a certain number of problems at an African summit. But what is important is that at least a consensus be obtained on the need to safeguard the independence of our continent and its nonaligned character.

[Question] Let me come back for a moment to Israel. I would like to ask you if, in your opinion, other African countries will follow Zaire's example, and if so, to your knowledge, has French diplomacy made a case with its African friends for a reestablishment of relations with Israel?

[Answer] I cannot reply to the first question. I have had no contact with states wanting to reestablish relations with Israel. Moreover, Zaire did not inform me of its intention. I do not know whether other African states were informed of this intention. I experienced no pressure, no approach from the French Government to reestablish relations with Israel.

[Question] Did other African states receive approaches from the French Government?

[Answer] I am not aware of any.

[Question] I come back to the OAU which is now adrift -- I think it was President arap Moi who said that. Do you not intend to present a Senegalese initiative for example, with an original idea on a possible salvage operation?

[Answer] I have told you my two ideas. I talked to you about an extraordinary meeting, but there was not a two-thirds majority of states in favor. I approached President arap Moi in the light and said at present I would be satisfied with a statement -- I do not mean a statement under duress -- a statement from the current chairman and the president of the host country saying the SDAR would not take part in the summit. Then we would believe the word of these heads of state.

[Question] Mr President, a topical question which is a bit more urgent: It is frequently said that in the Malvinas conflict Senegal has taken a stand for the British and that British planes are using Senegalese air facilities to refuel and to head for the Malvinas. I would like to ask you why you have taken the British side, when practically all the Third World countries have taken a stand on Argentina's side?

[Answer] Are you sure all the Third World countries have taken a stand on Argentina's side?

[Question] Practically....

[Answer] I am not sure. I am not even sure if a majority of Third World countries have taken the Argentine side, and in any case Senegal has not taken anyone's side. Senegal considers that on the basic issue there must be negotiations. We did not approve the method used by Argentina to assert its case and, bearing in mind the relations which we have with Great Britain, in particular with the EEC, we responded favorably to a request for overflight and landing by the British Air Force, but this does not in any way prejudge our position on the basis of the problem, which remains in its entirety, and I think this position is moreover fairly close to the position of your country.

[Question] What is your analysis of this conflict? Is it a rather archaic conflict, or like some people say, is it the forerunner of future confrontations between medium-sized powers for economic and strategic control of the seas?

[Answer] I do not think it is a conflict which presages inportant confrontations. I do not think so. I sincerely think it is a conflict on the basis of principles -- there has been a misunderstanding on both sides. It is a conflict I discovered myself, one I did not know about, quite frankly, until Argentina occupied the islands in question, and I think with a little good will, with the efforts underway within the international community, we should manage to curb this conflict and find a satisfactory solution within the shortest possible time.

[Question] You do not see a decolonization problem there?

[Answer] I do not see in this a problem of decolonization. I do not think Great Britain would want to keep the islands at any cost, but I do think Great Britain wants to defend a principle. I also understand Argentina would want to recover territory it considers as its own before the occupation by Great Britain. Thus, I think that through negotiations, we could arrive at a solution to this problem, but it is a problem which is very distant from us, and which we do not know as much about as you do.

[Question] Mr President, it seems to us that occasionally Africa is rather left out of the great international crises -- I am thinking of the Malvinas, or Poland, or even the Middle East. Is this due to prudence, or an inability to make yourself heard?

[Answer] I do not think it is because of prudence; our voice is very weak, as you say. We can speak very loudly, but it is difficult to make ourselves heard. I will admit something to you: In June I was supposed to attend the UN conference on disarmament. My predecessor attended a few years ago and made some very interesting proposals on this issue. There was no response. I took up these proposals again at the summit of French and African heads of state in November. There was a response from the Third World countries, but I do not think the matter will go far. Considering our weak voice and the small impact we have when we speak alone, it is not worthwhile for me to go to the United Nations and repeat myself on this issue when I am certain that I will not be heard.

[Question] The Malvinas conflict appears clearly as not just an East-West conflict, but as a North-South conflict. Now it appears that the South is no more united than in Africa.

[Answer] Yes, that is so.

[Question] There is no solidarity.

[Answer] You know, I don't think anyone was familiar with the problem. Once again, I think there is a problem of initial incomprehension of this problem. One fine day we saw Argentina occupying islands over which the British flag flew, and everyone asked why Argentina was taking the law into its own hands. Why hadn't Argentina taken the path of negotiations? As explanations became known we began to learn about the problem and form an opinion, which is not yet completely formed. I think the coming days will see a development of the analyses in the various countries concerned, the countries of the South in particular.

[Question] Mr President, now about South Africa. A few years ago all the Africans seemed to agree on undertaking certain actions to eventually eliminate the apartheid regime of South Africa. Well, for 2 years we have had the slight impression that the Africans are growing increasingly silent.

[Answer] Well, I don't have the same feeling as you. In all the meetings of African organizations, the nonaligned countries and Islamic solidarity conferences, for example, we condemn South Africa. Each time we can obtain a condemnation from the United Nations also, we do so.

[Question] But these are just pious wishes.

[Answer] There you are, it is because we do not have the necessary means. What do you want Africa -- even the whole of Africa united -- to do against South Africa? We don't have sufficient means. We are not going to start military action against South Africa which would be doomed to failure.

[Question] Yes, Mr President, you know very well that a certain number of African states have, without admitting it, economic relations with South Africa. Everyone knows it. So you know it.

[Answer] Yes.

[Question] Thus, already there is a sort of double talk in a certain number of African states. These states, while condemning apartheid in South Africa, maintain economic relations with South Africa through the use of front companies.

[Answer] I will even say that the time when diplomatic, economic and trade relations were broken with South Africa, Senegal lost important contracts; other African countries took these contracts. Senegal wanted to make its actions confirm with its commitments. This is true. But there are also states which cannot do otherwise because they are geographically close to South Africa. We must be fair and realistic. Economically, there are states which would be virtually suffocated if they did not have minimal economic relations with South Africa. I understand all of this but it does not prevent me from having the impression that if there is a point on which there is real solidarity among the African countries, then it is the problem of South Africa.

[Question] A few months ago, you explained that Senegal could not normalize its relations with Angola. Since then you have normalized relations. Does this mean you believe important stages have been passed in solving the problem Namibia?

[Answer] Let me say that I think there has been great delay in solving the Namibian problem. I think the recognition or rather the establishment of diplomatic relations between ourselves and Angola is likely to signify once again our wish to see the Namibian problem settled, and Angola stronger, and the problem of southern Africa in general solved in a just and equitable way as soon as possible. This is our modest role in the solution of these problems. We are very depressed to see there is a great deal of delay despite the efforts of the contact group.

[Question] There is another problem nearer to you, and which you tried to take part in solving, namely the Chad issue. On 30 June the inter-African intervention force is to withdraw, I believe. How do you see the development of the situation in Chad?

[Answer] Listen, we sincerely hope Africa can find the means to maintain the troops of the inter-African force in Chad until there is a final solution to this problem, a solution which, it must be recognized, cannot happen without a national reconciliation. Without national reconciliation no solution will be possible in Chad.

[Question] Do you think reconciliation is possible between Missene Habre and Goukouni Oueddei?

[Answer] Why not? I think the Government of National Unity is itself divided on this issue. Who knows whether those who want a reconciliation will win over those who are stubborn and do not want reconciliation?

[Question] May I come back to South Africa? The whites of South Africa are talking about sharing power with the Coloreds and the Asians, but not with the Blacks. Do you think that in spite of everything this is still a small step forward?

[Answer] We think it is pure hypocrisy and we are totally against [passage indistinct].

[Question] Do you think development of this cooperation which you mentioned a short time ago between France and yourself, between Europe and yourself, can solve your problems? And in what way can this cooperation contribute to getting Senegal out of its current situation?

[Answer] Yes, we sincerely think so. Again, as I said a short time ago, when a country is experiencing difficulties it turns to its friends and among the industrialized countries France is our main freind. Consequently, we think that when we need exceptional assistance to allow us to confront economic difficulties, we should address ourselves to France first. I would add that mechanisms have been established, which should not be forgotten, within the European framework, within the African framework. I am speaking in particular of the Stabex Fund within the EEC.

We believe that if France helps us ensure the normal functioning of this mechanism and that the compensation due to us is paid when we need it -- and paid in its entirety, not in a reduced form as happened last year when we received only 48 percent of the compensation we expected -- we would also welcome such assistance. I would add finally that France together with other Western countries can help us reduce the conditions set by bodies such as the IMF and the World Bank, which would permit these organizations to help us much more easily without forcing us to pull the rug out from under our own feet. I think there are three directions....

[Question] What exactly do you mean by that?

[Answer] I mean the following: When the IMF asks you to take such unpopular measures, ones which affect the deprived sectors in your country to such an extent that you risk causing popular riots or a loss of confidence in the political powers, then that cannot be called aid. If it came to that the IMF would no longer be able to find anyone, any political interlocutor, to discuss the continuation of the program. That is what I mean. I believe we are responsible governments; we have a duty to take measures, which are even sometimes very hard for our peoples, on the condition that the sacrifices are fairly shared in a very just way throughout the social and professional groups. However, we should not be asked to take measures that are so unpopular, shocking and inhuman that our people feel that those governing them are mischievous people who extort, rather than people full of goodness who want to bring about their happiness.

[Question] [Words indistinct] you seem to believe more in this kind of bilateral cooperation with France?

[Answer] Yes, but again I know France cannot do everything. France must exert its weight within these international bodies to see that these institutions change their conditions.

[Question] Mr President, I find that the questions we have been discussing for 45 minutes -- the North-South dialogue, the international bodies, African unity -- gave no room for hope or even for optimism. I would like to know, in your place, as a young head of a young state, what are the reasons for hope?

[Answer] The reason for hope, I think that so long as we are just.[sentence as heard] We have a feeling that there are privileged ones; that when there are sacrifices, some bear them, and not others. Thus the first condition is social justice, that everyone have the feeling of receiving the fruits of growth, or when there is growth that everyone should have the feeling of taking part in the sacrifice.

The second reason to hope is that we have undertaken ambitious plans. In agriculture, there is agriculture beside the rivers, on which we cannot count because of drought. But I have just come back from Bamako, where I took part with my two colleagues from Mali and Mauritania in laying the foundation stone of the dam at Manantali. The dam at Diama has started up. In a few years, Senegal, Mali and Mauritania will have not only riverwide agriculture, but also irrigated agriculture based on dams and irrigated areas. This is also a factor that can give optimism to future generations. Moreover, we have some promising indications that we may have certain mineral or oil resources. I do not say we will have them, but we have indications and we are now very actively pursuing our research in this field.

[Question] Mr President, I think you have been working for more than 10 years, I believe.

[Answer] Almost 11.

[Question] Almost 11 years in the leadership of the state. I would like to ask you very frankly and very concretely whether Western aid as it has been dispensed since you have been in power has been of any use in your development?

[Answer] This aid has been of some use, but its impact has been below our expectations. That is the reality. I think there have been mechanisms that have worked badly [words indistinct] qualitatively, priorities that have been badly defined, and this is why the impact has not been what it should have been. It should also be said that the quantity has not been what we expected.

[Question] But is this unusual? Who decides on the priorities, those who give or those who receive?

[Answer] In principle, those who receive should decide, but it has not always been like that. It is more and more like that but since independence it has not always been like that.

[Question] For several years a definite militarization of quite a number of African regimes has been noticeable, but Senegal has not only maintained its democratic nature but even extended it a year ago. I think there are 10 parties at present, or 12, representing various shades of opinion. To what do you attribute this exemplary originality of Senegal?

[Answer] Frankly it is difficult to answer your question. I know my country well and I know our regime is one that is best adapted to the nature of the country, its culture, its history. But I cannot speak for other countries.

[Question] May I ask you a more precise question? You have launched a broad campaign of political cleansing here in Senegal and some of your adversaries within the Socialist Party — a party of which you are one of the principal leaders — reproached you for using this campaign to settle some accounts, as can happen in a political party. In order to clear up this ambiguity, do you intend to give up some day occupying the office of president of the republic while simultaneously acting as principal leader of the Socialist Party of Senegal so that there is no ambiguity regarding the state and the party?

[Answer] Those who say all this do not know our country well, They do not know me. I do not have accounts to settle with anyone. You can ask any Senegalese of good faith and he will tell you that President Abdou Diouf has no accounts to settle with anyone.

This being said, in our countries one cannot govern if one is not supported by a strong party. I do not see, in a presidential regime in Africa, a president of the republic who is not supported by a strong party, inasmuch as there is a political life with political parties, in his country. But once again, I do not have accounts to settle with anyone and I can tell you this cause of struggle against corruption is a specific cause which does not result from calculation; it is a cause of justice to which I devoted myself together with my team because it must be done on behalf of the people and in the interest of the masses.

[Question] Mr President, speaking about democratization, there is talk in France that you are a bit irritated by the advice given to the opposition in your country by some people from the French Socialist Party or even the French Communist Party.

[Answer] I do not know about it. You are telling me something new. I did not know advice was given to our opposition. I deplore this because if the Socialist Party has any advice to give it should have given it to its brother, the Senegalese Socialist Party, not to the parties of the opposition.

[Question] There has been talk in Paris for the last few months [word indistinct] about attempted disinformation campaigns allegedly launched by French networks implanted in French-speaking Africa. (?May be not) in your country. I would like to know if you feel there are Frenchmen in your country who want to damage France's policy in Africa?

[Answer] No, I have never felt it. Our French community understands our problems, is perfectly integrated with Senegal and we have never felt any attempt at disinformation, either from outside or from within Senegal, or any attempt to damage Senegalese interests or French-Senegalese cooperation.

[Question] Have there been any attempts at destabilization in Africa, or attempts at disinformation?

[Answer] Disinformation, yes.

[Question] Disinformation?

[Answer] According to what I read in newspapers, yes. But [words indistinct] my colleagues, my assistants have never told my anything about it but according to what I read in newspapers there have been such instances.

[Answer] We have not spoken about the Socialist Internationale as yet. President Senghor plays an important role in the Socialist Internationale. Do you plan to play a role in the organization? And do you think this institution can help affect North-South relations and cooperation between Europe and Africa?

[Answer] Yes, I do sincerely believe the inter-African Socialiste can help to play a role because the leaders who participate very often fill important functions in their governments. As far as my own role is concerned, it will not be important for the time being because we have decided to divide the work between President Senghor and myself. It is President Senghor who represents Senegal in the inter-African Socialists and as you know he also participates in the Presidium of the Socialist Internationale and as such he plays a very important role, which we want him to continue to play on behalf of Senegal and of the Socialist Party.

[Question] Mr President, during this program we have tried to make our French listeners better understand the problems of Senegal and Africa. To conclude this program I would like to ask you a question which would perhaps [word indistinct] your explanation [words indistinct]. The French often do not understand the role and policy of cooperation -- this is true for both the majority and the opposition -- the French often have the feeling this cooperation is a waste of money. Could you try to tell them in a few words that the efforts of every one of us, at the level of each citizen, are not completely negative?

[Answer] Yes, I think that if they came to our countries and understood the achievements that have been made thanks to cooperation, they would understand that this cooperation is not fruitless and that the French taxpayers' money has generally been spent usefully -- with the reservation, as I said a moment ago, that its impact is not always as great as one would wish. If they could see the number of kilometers of paved roads or provisional tracks, the number of wells or water points, schools, clinics, the dams under construction, agricultural staffs and research, research in other fields, they would realize this cooperation -- which covers nearly all areas -- has allowed considerable economic progress in our countries and has set bases for future progress. I was speaking a moment ago about our hopes in the domain of mining or oil industry.

You may tell the French taxpayers that they have contributed to the fact that these hopes could have risen in our hearts since financing agreements are being signed every day that enable us to search for lignite here, [words indistinct], tungsten there, gold, oil and iron and phosphates. All these represent the things which will help the economic future of our country. One last word: I would merely like to point out that in a country such as ours, the true proletarians are the peasants, the rural world. I would like our friend France to understand that all efforts on our behalf should deal first of all with the progress of our peasantry, of our rural world of the peasants, shepherds, fishermen. They must be elevated to the level of other citizens of our country so that our country becomes genuinely strong economically and socially just.

ANGOLA

COMMUNIQUE ISSUED ON GABONESE PRESIDENT'S VISIT

EA261318 Luanda Domestic Service in Portuguese 0500 GMT 26 May 82

[Angolan-Gabonese joint communique issued on 25 May -- read by Foreign Minister Paulo Jorge in Luanda -- recorded]

[Text] His Excellency Omar Bongo, president of the Gabonese Republic, paid a working visit to the People's Republic of Angola [PRA] on 25 May 1982 at the invitation of His Excellency Jose Eduardo dos Santos, president of the MPLA-Labor Party and of the PRA.

His Excellency President Omar Bongo and his delegation received a warm and fraternal welcome from the people and Government of the PRA. President Omar Bongo laid a wreath of the sarcophagus of Dr Antonio Agonstinho Neto, immortal guide of the Angolan revolution, founder of the nation and of the MPLA-Labor Party.

During his visit, the two delegations exchanged views on issues concerning bilateral relations and cooperation between the two countries. They reviewed the worldwide international situation, particularly that prevailing in southern Africa.

During the talks, the president of the MPLA-Labor Party and of the PRA briefed his guest on the situation in southern Africa, particularly on the criminal attacks perpetrated by the South African racist and minority regime on the PRA sovereignty and territorial integrity, from the illegally-occupied territory of Namibia, in total disregard of OAU and UN resolutions and the wishes of the international community.

President Omar Bongo expressed his own strong condemnation of the attacks directed against the PRA by the forces of racist South Africa and called for their immediate and unconditional withdrawal from PRA sovereign territory. He expressed his solidarity with the Angolan people, the MPLA-Labor Party and the PRA in the defense of their territorial integrity and consolidation of national independence.

The two parties vehemently condemned the continuing occupation of Namibian territory by the racist regime of South Africa, they reaffirmed their active support for the free exercise of the legitimate right to self-determination of the Namibian people and called for the cessation of the occupation of Namibia and the urgent implementation of the relevant resolutions on the independence of the territory, particularly UN Security Council Resolution 435/78.

Regarding South Africa, the two sides unequivocally condemned the Pretoria regime, its policy of racial discrimination and apartheid and reiterated their support for the heroic struggle waged by the South African people. The two parties called for the application of global and mandatory sanctions by the Security Council on the Pretoria regime, so as to isolate it and force it to withdraw from Namibia and to abolish the inhuman apartheid regime.

Having reviewed the political situation on the African Continent, the two sides expressed their concern over the proliferation and aggravation of conflicts between African states. They called for the peaceful settlement of the conflicts, based on principles contained in the OAU and UN Charters. They also strongly appealed to other African countries to make efforts to safeguard OAU unity.

In this context, the two sides particularly discussed the situation in Chad. They reaffirmed the need to implement the OAU resolutions for a peaceful settlement of the conflict, in order to establish a just peace throughout Chadian territory.

The two sides discussed the situation in the Middle East and reiterated their support for the struggle of the Palestinian people and their legitimate representative, the PLO, for the recovery of their national rights and the establishment of an independent state.

The two sides expressed their conviction that a just and lasting peace will be achieved through Israeli withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem.

They felt that there remain unsurmountable conditions for an attempt at rapprochement with the Zionist state, as it is still occupying the Syrian Golan Heights and maintaining a certain degree of collaboration with the racist and minority regime of South Africa.

Regarding economic relations between the two countries, the two parties called for an increase in trade and increased economic, technical, scientific and cultural cooperation.

President Omar Bongo expressed his gratitude to President Jose Eduardo dos Santos, the Angolan people and government for the warm and fraternal hospitality given him and his delegation during their stay in the DRA.

LESOTHO

SOUTH AFRICA ACCUSED OF INVOLVEMENT IN ATTACKS

AB261748 Paris AFP in English 1724 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] Maseru, 26 May (AFP) -- South Africa was involved in recent ambushes in Lesotho including the attack on Agriculture and Marketing Minister Peete Peete on Sunday, Lesothan Prime Minister Chief Lebua Jonathan told Parliament here today.

The attacks were the work of supporters of NTSU Mokhehle, the self-exiled leader of the Basutoland Congress Party, who had South African assistance, Chief Jonathan said.

The extent of the collaboration between Mr Mokhehle and South Africa was no longer a probability but a reality, the prime minister said. Lesotho believes Mr Mokhehle is in South Africa.

South Africa wanted to destabilise and confuse Lesotho and force the country into submission as part of a general offensive against independent states in the region, Chief Jonathan said.

He said that Chief Peete Peete and five other people had been on their way to mass when their vehicle was ambushed by attackers hiding in maize fields.

Three of the five men were injured, and some were in "serious" condition, the prime minister said.

SOUTH AFRICA

FOREIGN MINISTER REACTS TO LESOTHO'S CHARGE

LD262140 Johannesburg International Service in English 2100 GMT 26 May 82

[Text] South Africa's minister of foreign affairs, Mr Roelof Botha, says it has been brought to his attention that the prime minister of Lesotho, Dr Lebua Jonathan, has yet again seen fit to attempt to draw South Africa into the problems which he is experiencing with dissident groups on his country's borders.

Mr Botha said these groups had been active against Dr Johathan's government since his party was defeated in the general election some 12 years ago, when he decided to suspend the country's constitution.

The Lesotho Government wished to make South Africa the scapegoat for its own inability to contain the opposition groups inside Lesotho.